

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 161

PS 007 923

TITLE Implementing Child Development Programs. Report of an August 1974 National Symposium. Early Childhood Report No. 10.

INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.

PUB DATE Dec 74

NOTE 106p.; Report of the Education Commission of the States, Early Childhood Task Force

AVAILABLE FROM Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203 (Paper, \$1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Achievement; Child Development; Childhood Needs; Cost Effectiveness; *Day Care Services; *Delivery Systems; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Federal State Relationship; Financial Policy; *Preschool Programs; *Public Policy; State Federal Support; State Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Education Commission of the States

ABSTRACT

This report contains the texts of addresses and panel discussions presented at a symposium of state decisionmakers. Five aspects of child and family services were explored: (1) priorities for creating and expanding child development services; (2) effective service delivery systems; (3) the relationship between state and federal governments (on the issue of child development); (4) costs of various approaches to child and family services; and (5) sources of technical assistance. The addresses, made by major state and national government personalities, included: "Making Children a Public Issue"; "Reassessing Our Educational Priorities"; "Public Policy and Early Childhood Education-a Buddhist Garden"; "Families and Children: Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?"; and "Making State Policies for Children." Organizing delivery services was the topic of two panel discussions; another panel examined day care and cost effectiveness. A list of program participants and a list of resource consultants are included. (ED)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

APR. 14 1975

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Implementing Child Development Programs

Report of an August
1974 National Symposium



A report of

The Education Commission
of the States

December 1974
Report No. 58

Early Childhood Report No. 10

ED110161

PS 007923

00002

Task Force Members

Milton Akers
Washington, D.C.

Hannah Atkins
Oklahoma State Representative

Robert W. Blanchard
Superintendent of Schools
Portland, Oregon

Nikki Blankenship
Early Childhood Bilingual Program
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
Austin, Texas

Howard Bray
Academy for Contemporary Problems
Washington, D.C.

Preston Bruce
Office of Child Development, H.E.W.
Washington, D.C.

Benjamin Carmichael
Commissioner of Education
Tennessee

Barbara Finberg
Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation of New York

D. Robert Graham
Florida State Senator

Dorothy Gregg
Director of Public Relations
Celanese Corporation
New York, New York

Beverly Gunst
Vice President, Nursery School
Association for Childhood
Education International

Orval Hansen
U.S. House of Representatives
Idaho

John Himelrick
Director
West Virginia Interagency Council
for Child Development Services

Hubert Humphrey III
Minnesota State Senator

Edwin Martin
Acting Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education, H.E.W.

Robert E. McNair
Governor of South Carolina, 1965-71

Mrs. Ray E. Miller
Chairman
State Advisory Council for
Vocational Education
North Dakota

John H. Niemeyer
President Emeritus
Bank Street College
New York, New York

The Rev. Albert Schneider
Superintendent
Archdiocese of Santa Fe
New Mexico

Howard Schrag
Director
Idaho Institute of Human Development

Marilyn Smith
Executive Director
National Association for the
Education of Young Children

Julie Sugarman
Chief Administrative Officer
Atlanta, Georgia

Daniel B. Taylor
Superintendent of Public Instruction
West Virginia

Jeannette Watson
Director
Texas Office of Early Childhood
Development

Burton White
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Education Commission of the States

Governor David Hall, Oklahoma
ECS Chairman 1974-75

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

Gene Hensley, Interim Director
Elementary/Secondary Education

Tommy Neal, Director
Early Childhood Project

Teresa Salazar, Associate Director
Early Childhood Project

Bonnie Barrett Stretch, Research Associate
Early Childhood Project

Marilyn Tadych, Administrative Assistant
Early Childhood Project

Connie Maslow, Secretary
Early Childhood Project

IMPLEMENTING CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Report of an
August 1974
National Symposium

The 10th report of
The Education Commission of the States
Early Childhood Task Force

December 1974

*Additional copies of this report may be obtained
for \$1.00 from the Education Commission of the
States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street,
Denver, Colorado 80203*

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Education Commission
of the States*

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

© 1974 Education Commission of the States

30004

Contents

Introduction	1
<i>Sally V. Allen, Director</i>	
<i>ECS Department of Communications</i>	
Making Children a Public Issue	5
<i>Mrs. Francis W. Sargent</i>	
<i>Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts</i>	
Reassessing Our Educational Priorities	8
<i>Burton White</i>	
<i>Director, Preschool Project</i>	
<i>Harvard Graduate School of Education</i>	
Public Policy and Early Childhood Education:	
A Buddhist Garden	19
<i>Edwin W. Martin</i>	
<i>Acting Deputy Commissioner, Bureau</i>	
<i>of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.</i>	
<i>Office of Education</i>	
Organizing to Deliver Services:	
Alternative Approaches	24
<i>Panel Discussion</i>	
Families and Children:	
Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?	42
<i>Walter F. Mondale</i>	
<i>U.S. Senator, Minnesota</i>	
Organizing to Deliver Services:	
The Public School System	49
<i>Panel Discussion</i>	
Day Care and Cost Effectiveness:	
A National Overview and a Case Study	64
<i>Panel Discussion</i>	
Making State Policies for Children	80
<i>Dale Bumpers</i>	
<i>Governor of Arkansas</i>	
Program Participants and Resource Consultants	87

Introduction

**Sally V. Allen, Director
ECS Department of Communications**

In December 1972, the Education Commission of the States Early Childhood Project held its first meeting on implementing state early childhood programs. Then we were convinced that any action for young children and their families would have to be generated in the states, but at that time there was very little experience to which state policymakers could turn when faced with hard decisions about what to do, how much it would cost and who would help. The situation in 1974 might be characterized by the parable of Michael, an energetic 5-year-old, who fell off the swings while at a child care center playground. A concerned staff member dashed over, swooped him up in her arms and repeated, "Don't cry Michael, don't cry, Michael, everything will be all right." Michael looked up at her, dry-eyed, and said, "Cry, hell; I'm going to sue."

There has been a change. The second symposium of the ECS Early Childhood Project reflected that change. The interval between the two meetings saw a growing national interest in the early childhood years. More importantly, it saw the emergence of a variety of state policies and programs that are worth careful examination by state policymakers across the country.

The ECS Early Childhood Project holds the continuing conviction that the action for children will be and should be centered in the states. Revenue sharing, a growing federal interest in state planning and state capacity to deliver services and the current paralysis of Congress all suggest that state initiatives are essential to early childhood programs. We are, frankly, not optimistic that the Child and Family Services bills recently introduced by U.S. Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota and U.S. Representative John Brademas of Indiana will herald large amounts of new federal money in the foreseeable future. It does appear, however, that Senator Mondale and Representative Brademas are now more seriously interested in the capacity of the states to deliver children's services and that the prime sponsorship section of their bills could be the target of productive debate. In any case, it is clear that no matter what happens to the bills, a state's track record in child development will be increasingly important in future federal funding plans.

This symposium on Implementing Child Development Programs was planned to make it possible for decisionmakers with

responsibility for child and family services — in state legislatures, governors' offices and state agencies — to explore at least five fundamental questions.

1. What priorities should a state consider as it sets up or expands child development programs? Drawing on research in early childhood and recent experience by several states in assessing needs and developing statewide plans, the symposium presented a wide range of concerns that states need to examine.

2. What are the most effective mechanisms to get services to children and families who need and want them? The symposium program addressed two sides of this issue. On the one hand, state-level administrative structures have been set up to coordinate children's services, but these, for the most part, bypass state education agencies. On the other hand, the state education department might serve as a service delivery system. Over the last three to four years some 17 state offices of child development or the equivalent have been set up. To a large extent they reflect suspicion and concern that state education departments can't or won't become involved in child development, broadly defined. Does this serve the better interest of children and families, or are overlapping systems being established, when the public schools could do the job? As states and as a nation, we have not faced this issue.

3. What is and what should be the relationship between the states and the federal government in child development? We have argued, of course, that the action should be in the states. At the symposium, Senator Mondale spoke to that issue and Governor Dale Bumpers, on the basis of his Arkansas experience, offered a state point of view. Their remarks are included in this report.

4. What are the costs of various approaches to child and family services? There has been very little useful information for policymakers concerned about allocating scarce resources among the variety of worthy causes. The problem is related, of course, to wide variation in costs among states and regions and to an apparent inability to develop a consensus on definitions and minimum program and staffing requirements. But we have long argued that theoretical research is of little use to policymakers unless researchers are willing to consider costs and cost effectiveness.

5. Once a state decides it wants to get into the child development business, where can it get help? This is still a new business; there is no single source to which states can turn for technical assistance with the variety of new and complicated problems they are facing. How can a needs assessment be carried out? Should a state revise its child abuse legislation? A major purpose of this symposium was to make available the best talent in the country to discuss concretely these technical assistance concerns.

Attending the symposium were nearly 300 persons from 40 states. The roster of participants included many nationally known ex-

perts, state and federal policymakers, members of the ECS Early Childhood Task Force and state leaders involved in the everyday problems of program implementation.

They came together to review the issues in implementing state child development programs, to benefit from the activities of the past two years and to begin to establish future priorities. The experience of this symposium — as reflected in both the presentations offered in this report and in the informal and intensive discussions throughout the meeting — indicates that the necessary momentum for implementing child development programs in the states is now well under way.



Making Children a Public Issue

Mrs. Francis W. Sargent
Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts

It is only within the last decade that programs for children have come into the spotlight. Before that, they were merged with all human service programs in one big pot. No one really knew what percentage of the budget they received or whether they received the services mandated by law. The reason children received such second-class status was simple — they couldn't vote, and unlike the elderly they couldn't create an effective lobby. It took surrogates like the people attending this symposium to do that for them. Children's programs in 1974 are looking better, although they have a still longer way to go. But I would like to review with you, for a moment, the progress we have made here in Massachusetts. I'd like to use it as a model for some of the other programs that we will face in the future.

The impetus behind the Massachusetts Office for Children was a 1970 report by Richard Rowe on child care in Massachusetts. It had been preceded by several other research projects, but it summed up contemporary thinking about children's services. In this report, Rowe advocated two basic needs for children in Massachusetts: the need for a central agency for children's programs and the need for education and development of young children.

Before the creation of the Office for Children, there were 13 agencies responsible for programs for children. They were characterized by buck-passing, disorganization and pressure to respond to adult needs first. The Office for Children has really changed all of this. It has not become just another bureaucracy. It has, I am proud to say, remained responsive to children and their parents. It has, through its regional councils, enabled grass-roots people to have a major role in the decision-making process and it has been an effective lobbying force at appropriation time.

The need for the education of young children on a developmental model has had a less successful history. Year after year since the report first came out, legislation has been submitted to the general court proposing a series of different systems. Two things are apparent from the successive failure of this legislation: the cost factor and the need for public education. Let me address both of these problems.

Whether we argue the federal case or the state case on the cost of developmental day care, the cost seems to be in the vicinity of \$2,000 per child per year. The federal government computed these costs to apply to every child eligible, in my opinion a somewhat unrealistic

assumption. But whichever way you add up the figures, the total cost is very high. So far it is higher than the taxpayer is willing to stand.

The other and, it seems to me, even more important factor is public understanding of the issue. The average taxpayer seldom knows what you mean by "developmental day care" or "home care." This understanding is crucial because, if we do not get the highest quality of care for our children, then there is no question that they are better off at home, no matter what their homes are like.

There has been a trend in this nation to penalize those who do not work and to go to unnecessary lengths to provide work for the unemployed. The proposals of the Nixon Administration for day care were not addressed to the needs of children; they were intended to get mothers off the welfare rolls.

Recently, unemployed construction workers in Trenton, N.J., demonstrated to demand the repeal of the environmental protection act. And here in Massachusetts, we have seen the highway construction lobby fight Mass Transport in the name of jobs.

Somewhere along the way we have gotten our values muddled. This is not an either-or situation. We have to work for good day care *and* the hope that mothers can become part of the job market. We have to work for clean air *and* a healthy construction industry. We have to find another way to move people besides highways and cars *and* still find work for the highway industry. And we may not achieve every social objective at once.

Perhaps the most revolutionary social legislation passed in this commonwealth in the past decade is the Special Education Act, or Chapter 766, which goes into effect in September 1974. This law mandates that every public school in the state must provide for the education of all children with special needs between the ages of 3 and 21.

One thing is sure about Chapter 766: its aims are not going to be accomplished overnight. First of all, every handicapped child, or every child with a special need, is not going to be identified by this September. But what this legislation does is provide the mandate and the right for every child to an education. This alone is a huge step forward. With the lead time that I think we have, I think that our most important immediate task, as administrators and legislators, is to educate the public about their rights — educate the parents, the children who are entering public school for the first time, the children who are already in the public schools, the teachers themselves, and the school and town committees.

The proponents of this legislation were mainly the parents of children with special needs, as well as the professionals in the field. These two groups have formed a coalition that is the best basis for a lobbying group, but they need to expand their activities and not just educate the legislators. They need to educate the broad public, the

people who are not only footing the bill but who are very apprehensive about their own children being in school with these handicapped children.

Last fall, I had the privilege of going to Sweden to study retardation programs and I was amazed at the public acceptance of the retardation programs by the people back in the communities. I said, "This couldn't have happened all at once. How did you do it?" The answer was very plain; they said, "We've been at it for 10 years, and the government has spent a lot of money on public education." It never would have sold itself without a lot of help.

When the public fails to understand and accept the premise of social legislation, then history has shown that this same public can modify and repeal progressive legislation. We are already seeing inroads made on civil rights legislation. We may yet see the erosion of the environmental protection act. We cannot presume that the public understands and appreciates special needs. We have to work with them, all the way, bringing them with us. Only then will we have secured the necessary social revolution.

Reassessing Our Educational Priorities

Burton White
Director, Preschool Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

My purposes are to inform and attempt to influence you about a topic I think is of the highest priority in regard to national educational policy, our national resources and last, but far from least, the solidity of our young families. That topic is the role of the family in the education of a young child, particularly during the first three years of life.

My specialty is the study of what it takes to help each child make the most of whatever potential he brings into the world through the experiences of the first six years of life. That's my special role both as a member of the ECS Early Childhood Task Force and professionally. I believe that our current national educational policy is significantly flawed in this particular problem area, that we're wasting much of our most precious natural resource — the people of the next generation — and that we're allowing the quality of everyday life for many of our young families to be far more stressful and far less rewarding than it could be. An awful lot of our most able young women have a miserable average day with two young children; very few people realize this, and the last ones to know are their husbands.

I've been conducting research on the early educational development of children for about 16 years now. When I say conducting research I don't mean every few weeks for an hour or two; I mean that's *all* I've been doing. Seventy-five per cent of my professional time has been on direct empirical research on this topic. I've come to some central conclusions that cry out for a new look at our national educational policy.

First of all, children start to learn long before they enter our education system. Traditionally, in this country and in every other Western country where there has been any writing on the history of education, the society first puts money into the job when the children get to be about 6 years of age. No society has ever put a lot of money into the first years of life, as far as I can find in the literature. Yet everybody knows that children are learning from the first day they come into the world. Although they don't usually learn to read, write or cipher much before 5 or 6 years of age, they do start, or fail to start,

to learn in more fundamental areas that seem to determine directly how well they will later learn to read, write and cipher.

There are at least four fundamental learning topics that all children cope with before their third birthdays. These are not debatable points, by the way. First of all—language development. We have known for years that language growth starts and, in a large way, develops to a solid working capacity before the third birthday. Two- and three-month-old children don't process the meaning of words at all; at 6, 7, 8 months, they begin to understand the meaning of a few selected words — not surprisingly, words like their own name, Mommy, Daddy, kiss, bottle. That initial vocabulary is reasonably well understood, I think. By the time they're 3 years of age, most children have the capacity to understand most of the language they'll use in ordinary conversation for the rest of their lives.

Now language is at the heart of educational capacity. It has its own primary value and, in addition, an instrumental value of direct relevance to all intellectual learnings. Subtly, but just as importantly, it also underlies healthy social growth. Sociability in the first couple years of life depends for its good development on some capacities in the language area, particularly when it comes to other children.

The second major educational foundation that's undergoing development in this first three-year period is curiosity. What could be more important to whether a child learns anything — not just about academic subjects, but about the world at large, about what makes people tick, about how to become a good listener — than simple curiosity. It's the birthright of every child, with a few exceptions — the badly damaged children, for example, may have less of it. But even if a child comes from a bad home and is beaten regularly, it's very difficult to stamp out strong, basic, simple, pure curiosity in the first eight or nine months of life. It is, unfortunately, not that difficult to stamp it out in the next year or two or, if not stamp it out, suppress it dramatically or move it over into peculiar aberrant patterns. Take for example, the 2-year-old who looks at a new toy and, unlike other 2-year-olds, sizes it up mainly to see how he can use it to badger his mother. That's not sheer unqualified curiosity. That can also be very tough on a young mother, by the way.

Third major point — social development. In the last five or six years we've begun to apply a little more serious attention to the value of social goals for our educational system, although we're still limping along in this area. For years we've had soft-hearted early-education people saying a child is more than a brain, but they have seldom been listened to because most of them don't have doctorates and most of them don't have the gift of gab. I personally believe, and have a lot of research evidence to support it, that the social skills that develop in the first preschool years are every bit as important, every bit as instrumental, to the intellectual success of a student, for example, as the directly intellectual skills. Moreover, I think a lot of people in this

country would be happier if the children we produced were not only bright but were people with whom they liked to live.

We are pretty clear now on the details of social development; we know that human infants won't survive without some sort of strong, protective attachment to an older, more mature, more capable human. And God or somebody else built into the creature a collection of attributes — tools, actually — that help in the cementing of a relationship to somebody.

For instance, that early social smile of the 3-month-old is not reserved for any particular person. It looks as if the child is using it on everyone who happens by. It's as if the species had a kind of first-stage guarantee of attractiveness. The 3- and 4-month-old child is an incredibly attractive, nice-to-live-with creature. He starts to giggle and becomes ticklish for the first time; he's given to euphoria a great deal. Now that's fun, and the photographers like it a great deal, but I think there's a more serious species-survival virtue to this particular kind of phenomenon.

Then, between 8 months and 24 months or so, there takes place one of the most gorgeous experiences you'll ever see. The child establishes a relationship—usually to the mother, because most of our children are still being brought up in homes by their own families. This is an incredibly complicated relationship, making most contracts pale in simplicity in comparison to it. The child learns thousands of things about what he can and can't do in his home, what he can and can't do in interactions with the primary caretaker, about how to read her different mood states, and an incredible number of other things. After all, little children have relatively little in the way of important obligations other than just enjoying themselves, and one of the few really overpowering interests of the child 8 to 24 months of age is that other key figure.

We have seen children at age 2 who are marvelous people to live with; they are free and easy; they are comfortable with their parents; they have gone by the negativism of the second year pretty well. They can play alone well. They are just a delight. On the other hand, how many times have you heard a mother of a 2-year-old say he doesn't play alone well? That's synonymous for he's hanging onto my skirt or my slacks or my legs all day long. That situation can be very rough, especially if there is another child, 8 months of age, crawling around in the home simultaneously. When we see a child for the first time at 2 years of age, it's too late. They are crystallized into their basic social patterns and we see those social patterns applied to all social encounters in the next year or two — to other children who come into the home, to older siblings, to other adults. A human personality is being formed during those first two years, and there is no job more important than doing that well.

Over and above that primal social development, we have the foundations of intelligence. There are all sorts of problems children

can't solve in the first two or three years of life, but they are learning the tools of the trade, and this process is beautifully and brilliantly explained, in detail, in the work of Jean Piaget, the Swiss student of the growth of intelligence. From the very first years, children are very much interested in cause-and-effect relationships, in learning about simple mechanisms such as jack-in-the-boxes and flipping light switches on and off to see the consequences. Such events are trivial little things on the surface, but they indicate a very deep interest in how things work and in the various characteristics of physical objects. After all, these children haven't had a chance to examine many things firsthand, and most things, therefore, are new to them.

Now, these four topic areas are, I submit, the foundations of educational capacity. I'll repeat them: language development, curiosity, social development and the roots of intelligence. They are all undergoing basic formative development in the first three years of life, and the national education system essentially ignores that fact.

These fundamental learnings do not always go well. Indeed, there's reason to believe that failures in these learnings in the first years lead directly to underachievement in the elementary grades and beyond. We're getting there after the horse has left the barn.

Moreover, poor results or failures in the first years are extremely difficult to correct using any means we now have available. I'll repeat that because it's a very strong statement and I think I can support it — poor results or failures in the first three years are extremely difficult to correct using any means now available, be it \$10,000 a year spent in a private tutoring situation or a Head Start or a Follow Through or a special education program.

In addition, relatively few of our children, regardless of the type of family that raises them—and that includes your families and mine, your grandchildren and mine—get as much out of the education of the first years as they might. We are probably wasting substantial amounts of our most precious resource, the developed competencies of each new generation.

Can I back up these claims, or am I just another in a long list of education sensationalists?

Point one: Children who enter the first grade significantly behind their peers are not likely ever to catch up. There are exceptions, but the norm is that they fall further behind. This has been recognized educationally for a long time.

Let me tell you a little story about the origination of the Brookline Early Education Project. The superintendent of schools in Brookline, Mass., who's a very smart and vigorous fellow, called me one day and said, "I've been reading things like Benjamin Bloom's statement that most of intelligence is already developed by the time the child is 8, and that half of it is in by 4. I put that idea together with the experience we have in our school system [where, by the way, next

year they have budgeted \$2,490 for each child at the high school level and \$1,900 for the elementary level]. I think I have a pretty good school system," he went on. "But I know that when I get a child in the first grade who already looks weak, I can't do much for him, even though I have one of the best special ed programs in the country."

Now as a reasonable man, he is driven to consideration of the topic of prevention. He has no choice. In fact, it's the same reasoning that led to the creation of Head Start. But here is a fellow who has no excuses — he has first-rate people, he has more money than God and he still cannot do the job.

He said, "I want to recommend that all kids get into our schools at age 4. What do you think of that as a good way to get into this problem?" I said, "That's a dumb idea." He said, "What do you mean? People have been telling me that public kindergarten is a great thing for all these years." I said, "Look, don't spend all your money on an expensive kindergarten program. Half or more of your kids are not going to get much out of it educationally, in my opinion. Take a look at what is going on in the first six years, not just in the fifth year. Try to get at the origin of educational deficits; try to prevent them. Try to help earlier in the game." And so we built the Brookline program. (For a more detailed discussion of the Brookline program, see pages 59 to 63.)

Second point: The country has been working on prevention for nine years now in a very substantial way. Head Start's original central purpose, I remind you, was to prevent educational failure. Now, it has had lots of other purposes that have grown in emphasis in the last four or five years—better early health care, better social and emotional development. But don't you forget that the original rhetoric that sold Head Start was to try to prevent educational failure. That has been its core purpose. It has had a budget, most of you know, of several hundred million dollars a year for these nine years, and it's been politically powerful. It has concentrated on the 3- to 5-year age period.

There are two conclusions I think can be easily drawn from the Head Start experience (so far) that are appropriate to this discussion: First, it doesn't often succeed in its prime goal (no matter what somebody working in a center tells you). The best objective evaluation of Head Start is that by and large, by itself, it hasn't had much success in preventing educational failure in the elementary grades. Second, serious deficits for many children are usually already visible at 3 years of age.

Point three: Except for the fewer than five per cent of our children born with serious defects or subjected to extreme abuse during the first year of life, serious educational deficits are not usually seen before 18 months of age. This point comes out of the educational and psychological research literature. The same children who are going to give you endless problems in the third grade look fine at age 1.

Point four: Educational failure begins to show itself toward the end of the second year of life. It is often very reliably detected at 3 years of age and nearly always detectable well before the first grade. Furthermore, educational underachievement by children who look average or slightly above average is quite likely, but has not really been investigated in a serious way as yet. After all, the emergency situation, as always, comes first.

What causes low achievement levels in children? Can we as educators do anything about this problem, or are genetics, for example, at the root of the problem? The question is a very complicated one, and I can't deal with it elaborately here. But I will summarize my position on the issue. We have no conclusive evidence as yet as to how much achievement is due to heredity and how much is due to environment. We have fragments of evidence, but nothing like the weight of evidence needed to resolve that issue on a scientific basis. My personal judgment is simply that both heredity and environment obviously play a role. Heredity certainly sets upper limits to development, but by itself it doesn't guarantee that those limits will be reached. If a child is seriously brain damaged, no matter how you work on his early education, he is never going to achieve the levels that an intact, well-educated child will. But if a child comes into the world with great genes, he is not going to make the most of that potential irrespective of what happens to him subsequently. By controlling his experiences, I can prevent any child in the world from learning to talk, I can prevent him from acquiring any of his skills.

Of course those are just the extreme cases. But my point is that so far we really haven't thoroughly understood what it takes to help each child make the most of the potential he has. We have no right to assume that, by hook or by crook, children are doing that. In fact, we have plenty of evidence that suggests that they are not. I've done more direct research on the role of experience in early development than all but a handful of people in the country, and I'm convinced of the power and relevance of early experiences in this area. Certainly until we have definitive evidence to the contrary, the most sensible policy is to assume that early experience makes important differences and to do everything we can to make such experiences as beneficial as possible.

For now, let me point out that there seem to be at least three major obstacles that families face in doing the best job of educating their young children. But let me digress for just a moment. I very much enjoyed Jessie Sargent's remarks, particularly about the wasting of resources and the need for public education, which I endorse. She did, however, refer to developmental day care and its costs in a way that I think may tend to mislead slightly. First of all, developmental day care, as far as I know, generally costs more than \$2,000 per year. Three thousand, I think is a better average price, and it can go higher. I agree with Mrs. Sargent that this country is not going to make that kind of

money available in the near future for all the kids who ought to have it or who need it. But more importantly, I think there's been a kind of assumption in the minds of some that the way children become educated is through contact with a professional in a classroom or a center; I don't think that's the way it's going to happen, and I don't think that's the way it ought to happen. I think the way it's going to happen is through the family as the first educational delivery system, rather than through a developmental day care center.

The three major obstacles, then, that I see families coping with in trying to do the best they can for their children are: First of all, ignorance. They don't know how to do the job. They don't know, for example, about the poison-control data that says that most of our reported poisonings in childhood take place between 10 and 30 months of age. More importantly, they don't know why such poisonings take place at that age. They don't know that babies in that age range are incredibly curious, are inclined to use the mouth as an exploring organ and are unsophisticated about labels that have warnings on them.

Parents don't know the story of social development. They don't know, for example, that to be a 9-month-old *only* child means to live in a world that is full of happiness, sweetness, pleasant interpersonal relations. On the other hand, to have an older sibling at home who is 2 years old almost invariably means being on the receiving end of genuine hatred from time to time.

Now that sounds funny, but boy I'll tell you, it's a sad thing to watch a 9- or 10-month-old baby, when his mother isn't looking, trying to put up with the real physical threats of a 2- or 2½-year-old child who had previously thought the whole world was built for him. Now he's got to share it with this creature that's into his toys, that seems to have first place in his mother's affections, and so forth. It is painful for everybody. The older child is having a very tough time; the younger one is having a tough time and may be experiencing things that I don't think anybody should have to experience, if we can avoid it. The mother may be having the worst time of all. Some women spend the whole day trying to control two such children, trying to avoid the destruction of the baby; and the father comes home at night and wonders why the mother is tired. The simple fact is we don't prepare or assist people for this job. As long as you can mate, you are eligible to have a child and the responsibilities that go along with it. That's absolutely crazy.

The second major obstacle for parents is stress. The 8- to 24-month period is not only educationally critical, in my opinion, but it's also one of the most dangerous periods in life. I would guess that there is no period of life that is more dangerous in terms of maimings and accidental deaths.

Take, for example, an 8-month-old child who, for the previous three months or so, has had mature visual and auditory capacities,

but hasn't been able to move his body anywhere. Move him to an upright posture, he can see out into the room. It's a new world for him; no matter how poor it is, it's all new to him, and somehow or other his species requires that he learn as much as he can during his early developmental years. Think of how much curiosity is building up inside that mind. Then all of a sudden he discovers he can get from here to there — and he goes. It's a very rare child who doesn't go. Children at this age are very much like puppies, kittens, even young horses I've been told, in their pure, unadorned curiosity. It's necessary for the species.

They go, but they don't know anything at all about the world. They don't know that if you lean on something very spindly, it will fall; they don't know that those beautiful rose-colored shards of glass from a broken vase are dangerous. Everything looks interesting, and one of the prime ways in which they explore something first hand is to immediately put it to the mouth. They are very impulsive at that age; they do not stop to smell, to savor or to sip; they just bring it quickly to the mouth.

We have to tell parents about these things. Why should they learn these things after they go to the pediatrician to have a child's stomach pumped? These aren't controversial matters. There's a lot of controversy in this field about some topics, such as how you should rear children, whether you should teach them to read at nine months, whether you should be stroking their limbs at four months for "tactile stimulation." There's a lot of controversy in that area, but there isn't any about safety.

Every family should know how to safety-proof a home for the child's first crawling efforts. Every family should know that a baby starts to climb at about 8 or 9 months of age, can generally only climb six or seven inches at that point, but by the time he's a year old will be able to climb units of 12 to 14 inches, which means that he can climb almost anything in a room. That sequence has very powerful everyday consequences for a family. It should be common knowledge. Why is learning to drive a car so much more important than learning how to parent a child? Does the high school curriculum have room for driver ed and no room for these topics?

Not only are the first years a dangerous period of life, but they mean extra work. The child crawling around the home makes a mess, and if your husband likes a neat home, that adds to the stress. In addition, if there's an older child who is less than three years older than the child, it's quite normal for there to be significant resentment on the part of the older child, and that also adds to the stress on the mother. Furthermore, when the child gets to be 16 or 17 months of age he starts testing his power with his mother. That's quite routine; almost everybody goes through it. Some people find this very tough to take. So, there is a lot of stress involved in raising a young child, and raising two or three closely spaced ones creates almost an intolerable

amount. Sometimes it is not tolerated, and women crack up and marriages crack up.

Third obstacle: lack of assistance. Mother usually faces this job alone.

So the three obstacles I see through our research are, first, ignorance — they aren't prepared for the job, they aren't knowledgeable, indeed there's an awful lot of misinformation around; second, stress; and third, lack of assistance. That is a tough collection of obstacles to get through.

If there is a role for education, what is it? We must accept the fact that professional educators, working directly with children, especially children over 6 years of age, have much less influence on development than was previously thought. This is, by the way, the major implication of the 1966 U.S. Office of Education report by James Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Lots of threads of evidence are contributing to the not/on that professional education after the child is 6 very often just doesn't have the clout that so many parents in this country seem to believe it has, and that so many professional educators somehow assume that they have.

I remember a poignant story about a teacher in IS 201 in the heart of New York about six or seven years ago describing his classroom, a third-grade classroom. He said that at no time could he count on more than 30 per cent of the youngsters to be in their seats, and at no time could he count on more than half of them to even be in the room. And he said, "Somehow or other, I'm not doing well in that class." And I said, "How on earth can you expect to do well in that class?" I think teachers have been taking a terribly bad rap in this country. Educating a child is a partnership between the family and the professional educator. I think the senior partner is the family.

The second thing educators must do is recognize that the family ordinarily is the first educational delivery system for the child and seriously accept and face the consequences of that fact.

Third, we should prepare and assist the family for that fundamental educational job.

How do we prepare and assist the family to give the child a solid educational foundation? Here are a couple of suggestions.

Item one: Long before the child is born, we should teach each and every prospective parent all the known and accepted fundamentals about educational development in the first years of life. How do we do this? I would suggest through required courses in the high schools and, second, through public television. I would also suggest that neither of these vehicles costs a great deal. We might delete the geography of India for a year or for one semester.

Item two: Just before and soon after the baby is born is a special time. A lot of parents are traumatized. They suddenly come face to face with the reality that they've got the responsibility for this fragile little thing and they don't know what they're going to do. That can be

a very tough experience. I've had lots of young parents express that fear spontaneously to me. Suggestion: Teach each and every parent whom you missed the first time around the same information and routinely provide refresher information to the remainder. How? Offer adult education courses, year in and year out, for pregnant women and their husbands. Perhaps provide video-cassette or filmed minicourses in hospitals during the lying-in period. That's being done in Hawaii, by the way. Most of these things are being done somewhere in the country. Provide high-quality public television material on a continuous basis. There's no reason why it cannot be done. I'm involved in commercial television right now, talking about educating an infant. It works well. The viewing audience is dedicated; they watch that program like hawks. If I say something wrong, they're right on it. It can be done, and it can be fun, too.

In addition, just before or soon after the child is born, provide a low-cost education early detection and referral service to every family, with a promise that if a family participates, its children cannot go through the preschool years with an undetected educational handicap. You can make that promise and you can deliver on it for about \$200 per year for a child. We are running such a service at the Brookline Early Education Project. I think it's a much smarter investment than public kindergarten for everybody.

Item three: After the child is born, for his first six years of life, especially the first three, I suggest the following: make available continuing, low-pressure, strictly voluntary training for parents. How? Through resource centers and a home-visiting program. I'm talking, you'll notice, about working through the family, not bypassing it and going directly to the child. Provide for monitoring educational development as an extension of that early detection and referral system, again through medical, psychological and educational teamwork in resource centers, for about \$200 a year.

Provide general assistance for parenting, again with a focus on education, in the following ways: Lend materials like toys and books out of your resource center. Have films and pamphlets available. Have professionals available for parents to talk with once in a while. Have other parents available so that people can talk to each other about their frustrations and their joys.

Provide free baby-sitting for psychological relief for parents. This is not day care; I'm talking about a few hours a week when a mother can just leave her child, without guilt, and just get away.

On the other hand, a home-visiting service, especially for families who want it and who have a little more difficulty with their children and fewer resources than average, again does not have to be a frightfully expensive affair. We find that if you go very often to a home, more than every two or three weeks, it gets uncomfortable. There is not enough to do for most families; so if you go for an hour or two every six, seven or eight weeks we guess that's plenty. These kinds

of programs are nowhere near as expensive as running a conventional center; nothing like it.

Item four: Provide referral service for special needs, an ombudsman function. How do you do it? Through neighborhood resource centers. Provide remedial assistance as soon as possible. If an early detection program finds a borderline hearing difficulty in a 6-month-old child, we can do things about that today. It's scandalous for this country to continue to let some fraction of our children go through primary language acquisition with untreated, unnoticed hearing deficits. The screening examination can be done for \$15 or so and the occasional higher level diagnosis will cost \$50 to \$75. But what an investment!

I think it's fair to say that the entire task force of the ECS Early Childhood Project agrees with the general desirability of strengthening the family for its role as the child's first educational delivery system. Exactly how far to go in terms of dollars per year, of course, is not fully agreed upon. I suggested to you that for an expenditure of perhaps \$300 or \$400 per year we probably could do the bulk of what needs doing on this topic for most families (not for the very special-need families; they are a much more expensive proposition). Exactly which ideas to use, again, are not fully agreed upon, but I submit to you that there is a core of fundamental information about safety, about social development, about motor development that most people do agree on, and that such information could be very, very useful to young families. Much needed assistance is feasible today. You could spend \$1,000 a year for an average family, but I think you could do it quite nicely for \$400 or \$500. And there just isn't a better way to spend that money than to invest in improving the quality of our earliest educational systems.

Public Policy and Early Childhood Education: A Buddhist Garden

**Edwin W. Martin, Acting Deputy
Commissioner, Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped,
U.S. Office of Education**

Public policy in the area of provision of preschool and early childhood services seems destined to be based on the same assumptions that my wife and I use in what she has called our Buddhist approach to gardening. That is, we begin with a reverence for all living things, and then we allow them to grow around our house as they will. I can report to you that this approach involves a minimum of prior planning, that the results are judged to be uneven at best by third-party evaluators, and that later revisions are costly and difficult.

I am tempted to say that I am here today to raise some questions about delivery systems for early childhood education. For example, who shall be responsible? Should our goal be to develop a publicly supported delivery system, or should we assume an essential role for the private sector in our planning for full services for all children? Should we assign responsibility to a single public agency, or should we assume that employing many agencies will provide "creative pluralism" or will allow "flexibility"?

I am going to resist attempting to pass myself off as a neutral statesman, dispassionately raising these questions, merely to assure that those of you legislators, state executives and board members who create public policy would be sure to attend to these important concerns. Not only do many of you know that I am a constitutionally predetermined advocate-type, but I feel my label as an education official might seem to mar my credibility as a dispassionate observer.

So, here are my propositions:

1. Public policymakers should "bite the bullet" and begin the process of making a specific decision about where the responsibility for early childhood education services should be lodged. No more Buddhist gardening.

2. Public policy must be based on the assumption of equal access for all children, and so a public system must be developed based on this "zero reject" concept. Private agencies can offer alter-

natives for those who can afford them, or serve as subcontractors for the public agency.

3. A single public agency should be charged with the primary responsibility.

4. That agency should be the public education agency.

Now, I am tempted to sit down, or perhaps go home, rather than elaborate, but I warned about my incurable advocacy impulses. Actually, lecturing a group of early childhood specialists and policymakers about early childhood policy making, reminds me of the time Robert Kennedy, then attorney general, came to speak at the University of Alabama, soon after the governor had stood in the gymnasium door, (euphemistically known as a schoolhouse, but more accurately the site of registration activities). The governor was incensed by the attorney general's visit — to say nothing of how he felt about the university for inviting him — and said it "was like inviting the fox into the chicken coop," a metaphor that was met with mixed enthusiasm by the university community. When at last Kennedy stood safely on the stage inside the notorious Foster Auditorium, he made note of the governor's remarks, saying that he felt "more like the chicken in a fox coop." I think you can see the parallel between his feelings and mine.

My first proposition, concerning the need for a decision, is based on the belief that we will have universal preschool and early education, and that we will evolve into it in a somewhat random fashion by extending public school programs by expanding Head Start, by developing new federal initiatives in family and child services such as those proposed by the recently reintroduced Mondale and Brademas bills, by developing new state offices of child or human development, by developing day care centers and community health and mental health programs, and by working with a variety of private profit and nonprofit agencies.

I think such a development process will result in all of the problems we now see in many of our government programs: conflicting responsibilities and assumptions, duplication and overlap, gaps and unevenness of access, wide variations in quality of services, etc. — a litany you surely know as well as I. Further, we are dealing with a tremendously large potential population: 17.2 million children between birth and 5 years of age, and 20 million more between 5 and 9, to mark arbitrary end points. I believe it is accurate to say that no formalized public-service delivery system other than the schools deals with such a large population and its attendant logistical problems.

Governors, legislators, public officials and even we professionals must face this issue squarely and establish firm patterns for the development of services. Further, every effort must be made to

provide a basis for coherent federal policy by interstate and federal planning.

My further propositions merge into the proposal that the public education agency be identified as the lead agency, or primary provider of services. I am aware that this proposal, while somewhat more acceptable than Jonathan Swift's "Modest Proposal" that citizens eat their babies as a solution to food supply and population problems, still will have its antagonists in two major groups — first, those child development specialist who operate in nonpublic school environments and, second, those persons who run the schools — or to be more fair, perhaps some substantial part of each group.

But the needs for coherent public policy must outweigh the provincial concerns of special-interest groups. If the school administrators or school boards are reluctant to take on this role, but we believe it to be in the public interest, this reluctance can be overcome. Recent examples that come to mind include providing educational opportunity for black and for handicapped children.

The fact is that there are many reasons for policymakers to consider the schools as the preferred service delivery mechanism. Without elaborating, let me name a few. There is a broad local and state fiscal base already extant that is designated for these basic purposes, i.e., the development and enhancement of the child's potential through the process we can define "broadly" as education. There are examples, already, of basing support for early childhood education on adaptations of state-aid formulas for education. There are buildings and the capacity for financing new construction or for remodeling exists. Further, the decline in birth rate is already reducing the crowding in many schools and this pattern seems likely to continue. Although many early childhood programs, such as home-based programs, would not need school building space, still others could use such facilities and are now housed in substandard facilities.

In addition, the public education system has the capacity to set standards, to certify, regulate, etc. While we are aware of the dangers of "over credentialing," appropriate standards will be desirable. The capacity to train educators and specialists is in place, and it, too, is seeking new avenues for development. I am not suggesting simply retraining "surplus" teachers, although many good early childhood specialists might be found in such populations; rather I am looking toward the capabilities of universities to develop new and effective early childhood education training programs to meet the changing demands of their students.

Finally, the schools are already moving in the direction of providing early childhood services, particularly in relation to services for handicapped children. Several states now mandate the provision of education, including comprehensive services, to handicapped children from age 3, and a number have provided what we call per-

missive legislation — that is, local districts may provide and be reimbursed for programs beginning as soon after birth as a child may be identified as handicapped.

These efforts are in the early stages, but they show a rapid growth rate. The evidence that effective programming can ameliorate or prevent later educational handicaps is such that we have made stimulating such programming a major priority of the U.S. Office of Education. In short, it seems likely that the public schools will offer preschool services to all handicapped children within the foreseeable future. Will some other agency provide parallel services to nonhandicapped children with all the attendant problems of continuity of programming when the youngsters reach school age? I hope not.

In identifying the schools as the prime service delivery agency, I recognize that many of the children we hope to serve will require what we have come to call "comprehensive" programs — that is, they will require special attention to their nutritional needs, health needs, etc. Further, a basic direction for such programming seems to require a major emphasis on strengthening the ability of the family to help meet the multiple needs of the child, rather than trying to replace the family with a social agency. I see none of this as inconsistent with the future role of schools as a total community resource. For example, the education system already has accepted the responsibility for responding to the nutritional needs of children, and there is increasing concern about improving the quality of the health delivery system within the schools. I do not foresee the school system as necessarily having to supply all health and related services, but it can certainly take on the role of assisting and aiding parents in the location and receipt of needed services.

A recent study done by Rand for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare described the need for such "direction" centers, as they called them, as being a paramount concern if we are to respond appropriately to an estimated population of nine million children with various handicapping conditions, to say nothing of perhaps an equal number of nonhandicapped, economically disadvantaged youngsters with similar needs.

Among our objectives for improved services for handicapped children will be to encourage through model programs, and through the use of other federal funds, the development of identification and appraisal programs, direction centers and full educational programs for youngsters beginning as early in life as feasible. We have learned from many of our efforts for handicapped children that the tools and skills of the special education profession are most effective for dealing with nonhandicapped children as well.

In sum, we will be working to build comprehensive programs within the schools that will provide a basis for high-quality services for

handicapped children beginning very early in life. I see no reason why these goals for the school system should be limited to services for handicapped children and should not be seen as the basis for similar programming for all children.

The "clear and present danger," to coin a phrase, is that those of us who see ourselves as the creators of public policy will continue a laissez-faire attitude, immobilized between various pressure groups and restrained by budgetary problems. This will lead us to all the problems in this area to which I have referred and to much rhetoric about wasteful duplication, overlap, etc. Study commissions will be appointed to see how to coordinate programs; new offices will be proposed, perhaps sitting right in the governor's anteroom to be sure they will have sufficient "clout," and so on.

In summary, then, while it may be fair enough to say to the public, "I never promised you a rose garden," I don't think we want to deliver them a Buddhist garden instead.

Organizing to Deliver Services: Alternative Approaches

Moderator

Jule Sugarman
Chief Administrative Officer,
Atlanta, Ga.

Panel

Benjamin Carmichael
Commissioner of Education, Tennessee

Hubert Humphrey III
State Senator, Minnesota

David Liederman
Director, Office for Children,
Massachusetts

Barbara Mosses
Chief of Contracts, Grants and Special
Services Division, Department of Social
Services, South Carolina

Jule Sugarman: One of the things that has always gratified me about ECS is the fact that it is one of the few professional organizations I know that has had the courage to bring into their tent a lot of outsiders. In fact, on the Early Childhood Task Force, less than half the members are people identified with the public education system. As a result, we get a kind of dialogue and development of ideas that one does not find among people who are all drawn from the same group.

Edwin Martin has publicly set forth a challenge for me to respond to his very effective and carefully analyzed speech. Actually, this is sort of a conspiracy on the part of the two of us because we believe that the time has come when the early childhood field needs serious public debate about where it ought to go and how it ought to get there.

I want to make my position as clear as I can to begin with. My arguments today and in the past and in the future are not arguments that the public school system should not operate, should not control, should not coordinate, early childhood programs. My arguments are that there should not be either an automatic monopoly or an

automatic preference for the public school system to do this sort of thing. I will basically argue that that kind of decision needs to be made, not on the federal level or even on the state level, but at the local level where the programs are actually delivered. There should be the flexibility and the choice in each state and in each community to pick the particular administrative vehicle they feel can best handle the job. That may end up, in many places, as being the public school system. I suspect, though, that if matters were honestly considered, that it would end up being other than the public school system in many situations.

Now, Mr. Martin set forth some rather clear-cut hypotheses. I hope that I can equal that in terms of the principles that I set forth. Number one: Early childhood programs, conceived broadly as they ought to be, are essentially different in character from the programs operated by the public school systems. It would, in fact, be a great mistake to conceive of early childhood as simply an extension downward of the conventional classroom situation. I believe, for example, that probably the great majority of young children in this country do not require a classroom-type education program in the early childhood years. I believe to the contrary that what we need is a variety of programs so that the one that is right for a particular family — and I want to emphasize “family” — and a particular child, is the one that’s available. That may mean nothing more than a play school; it may mean dealing not at all with the child but only with the parent; or it may mean dealing with the child and parent together. It may mean a nursery school, or it may mean kindergarten. It may mean a lot of things.

I think, for example, that in many ways the enthusiasm and action that has been generated to initiate public kindergartens across the country has some drawbacks to it; that it may have, in fact, concentrated a fair amount of dollar resources in a program that was either unnecessary or of the wrong order for many of the children for whom it was designed. It is hard for me to argue against it because it is a little like motherhood, and in many places it has done good things for children. I would argue, however, that we might very well, even now, consider whether those same resources could be applied in different ways to achieve more results with more families and more children.

Before I go further, let me say that I am willing to negotiate with Mr. Martin. If I could be assured that the education system would take one-twelfth of its resources and devote them entirely to working with families and young children, I would concede the argument of sponsorship. I think that is not an impossible matter. I think, in fact, our education system from the elementary through the high school levels is probably too long for most youngsters today, that we do not need four years of high school or six years of junior high and senior high. While we constantly talk about reevaluation of priorities and

reallocation of monies, nobody is seriously addressing the question of whether the total dollars that we are investing in the education field could not be reallocated in a way that would provide money where it is needed — in my judgment, in the early childhood area. However, since I do not expect you to be able to make that one-twelfth commitment, I have to continue with my enunciation of principles.

My first one, of course, was that school programs and early childhood programs are different in character and that you need an organization that has the capacity and flexibility to deliver those different programs. That is why I think some of Mr. Martin's arguments about the availability of school facilities and the availability of trained elementary school teachers are not really relevant, because those are not necessarily the facilities and skills we need to deliver early childhood programs.

My second position or hypothesis is that there is, inherently, no strength of a professional nature in an education system that is automatically better or worse than the strength of a professional system in the social work field, in the health care field, in the mental health field or in the early childhood field (if you can separate that out). I find, in fact, that when individuals are confronted with a specific human being — whether they are a social worker or an educator or a mental health specialist — that they do not deal with that child in fundamentally different ways.

We have created, it seems to me, a mythology that educators know how to educate children and health care people know how to provide health care and mental health people know how to deal with mental health, when in fact, to a very substantial degree, they overlap one another in their professional competence or in the things that they actually do for children. We all talk about the whole child, and yet we keep on trying to carve him up professionally or bureaucratically. I think that is a mistake.

No particular profession or bureaucratic institution has a monopoly on being better able to do things. I have had the chance over the years, because of my involvement with Head Start, the Children's Bureau and the U.S. Office of Child Development, to visit probably close to 1,000 programs around the country, and I must say I cannot tell you that any one institution is better or worse, even on an average basis, at developing and delivering services to children. I have seen school systems that do a fantastically good job of that and I have seen school systems that do an abysmally bad job of it. I have seen the same thing with respect to community action or Head Start agencies, the same thing with respect to health care and social service agencies. And I have come to believe that the capacity of organizations to do this relates much more clearly to the individuals who are involved and their capacities and their philosophies, and to the situation in that community, than it does to whether there is a particular kind of profession or a particular kind of institution involved.

My third hypothesis is that the most relevant factor of all in selecting the institution to have the authority over early childhood programs relates basically to individual capacity, individual attitude and individual competence. Mr. Martin posited certain things which he suggested were advantageous to the public school system in that respect, and I'd like to run through that list for just a moment.

He said, for example, that the school system has a tax base, which offers a good point to start in terms of funding early childhood programs. That's true; in most communities the school system does have a tax base. In almost all of those communities it's the property tax base, and I think nothing has become more apparent than the inequities of the property tax, both in terms of what it does to the taxpayer and in terms of what it delivers to communities that need service. We've had a very substantial number of cases and decisions in the state courts and in the appellate courts that have, in effect, said that the property tax is no longer a viable means of supporting public education because it provides a lot of money for communities that have wealthy people living in them and a lousy return for those communities that are poor. So, if we're talking about a tax base that's the property tax base, I would argue that that's a disadvantage rather than an advantage of the public school system.

Mr. Martin talked about existing buildings and available space. As I've indicated before, these may be useful for certain kinds of programs under certain circumstances. But, if we're going to go into an elementary school that has three empty classrooms and then have, without question, to lock young children into that school's routine, then I don't want early childhood programs in that school. If we're not going to be able to eat in a community style because everybody eats in a cafeteria at the assigned 15-minute period, I don't want to use those buildings and facilities. In other words, if that school and that space are available only on the terms of a conventional school program, then I think we ought to turn the offer down.

I am not saying that every school is like that, because they're not. There are marvelous principals and teachers who have really changed their schools around, and where they do I think we ought to recognize it and use it. But it is not the universal practice.

Mr. Martin suggests that the public schools are practiced in the setting of standards and the certification of staff. I have to say that I think that that experience is a disastrous experience, that it has led to the growth of a credentialism philosophy that has very little, if any, relevance to the capacity of teachers to perform. Now that is an extreme position. I happen to believe it is a correct position. I am not against a system of evaluation and standards. I am against what I see put forth as a system of evaluation and standards in most of the public school systems with which I am familiar. I see some movement away from it in recent years as the use of performance evaluations, in addition to conventional credentials, has become more widespread.

The availability of surplus teachers is a fact, I think, in many communities now. The question is, are they the right teachers? Are they the teachers who have been, in fact, prepared to work with children at earlier years, to work with parents in the way they need to be worked with in preschool years? The answer is "yes" in some cases and "no" in many others. And nothing could be worse in the early childhood field than to automatically transfer everybody who loses their job as an elementary teacher to an early childhood program. Those of you who were around in the first summer of Head Start will remember some of the experiences that we had with that policy of using elementary school teachers. Again, I don't want to condemn all elementary school teachers; many of them have the necessary capacity and flexibility. But you need to make the choice on the facts in that community, not on some universal basis.

Mr. Martin said, and I think correctly, that many school systems are already moving toward a more flexible approach; and I say more power and more help to them in doing it, if it is well done. I do not want to push anybody out of this business; in fact I have argued for many years now that there is so much to do that we really need the involvement of everybody. We need the social agencies, we need the health agencies, we need the private nonprofit organizations, and I would even argue we need the for-profit organizations, although I do that with some caveats about how they get used. I believe that that job out there is so tremendous that there is room for everybody to be actively involved in it.

Finally, Mr. Martin suggested that the continuity of programming was an important aspect of placing early childhood within the orbit of the public school system. I have to agree, theoretically, that that is an important concept. I must say that I am not impressed with the evidence that there is any continuity in the public school system as it now exists. I say you can see very little relationship in most schools between what the second-grade teacher does and what the third-grade teacher does, and certainly not between what the elementary school teacher does and the junior high school and the senior high school teachers do. I think continuity is one of those things that one assumes happens when you have a unitary organization, but which bureaucratically and factually rarely occurs. So, I have serious doubts that it will happen to any greater extent in the early childhood area.

Senator Hubert Humphrey mentioned to me earlier that in his community, for the first time, after many years of having both preschool and school-age programs, the teachers got together for a meeting. Now, that does not mean they are working together, but they at least took that first step of getting together for a meeting. It is a very real bureaucratic problem — and it is a *bureaucratic* problem, not a professional question. It is a question of how do you make it happen.

Now I have been tilting at windmills here and knocking down.

straw dogs; what have I got to offer instead? What I offer instead is not a choice, but a method of making a choice, a method of analyzing the situation in a particular state and a particular community. I would like to list what I think are the important elements of analysis so that you can decide whether it is the school system, the health care system, the social service system, the governor's office or the community action agency, etc., that should have authority over early childhood programs in your community.

Organizations are supposed to be built on principle and not on people. I am not sure that is a good idea. If I had to make a choice, *de novo*, in my community, I would look for that group of people with the most enthusiasm and the most energy and the most concern for young children, and I would give them a big plus to start with, regardless of where they were bureaucratically. I would look at them in terms of their flexibility, in terms of their willingness to do things differently, in terms of their zeal, if you will, because I just happen to think that zealotness and commitment are a major determinant of how well an organization does its job. You have some risks there, admittedly. You may pick one group of people and they may go overboard in their approach; then you've got the wrong organization. But to pick an organization without a look at who is actually going to do the job — what is that curriculum division like, what is that superintendent like, what is that school board like — I think is a mistake.

Second, I think that you must carefully examine the legal constraints that would affect that agency. Is there anything in the state constitution that is established and probably unchangeable? Is there anything in the state laws that is going to seriously limit the capacity of that organization to do the job that needs to be done? For example, is there a prohibition in the law or state constitution against using anyone but certified teachers in working with children? Is there a legal requirement that programs be conducted in a specific kind of facility, a school building? Is there a law that delimits the hours? Is there something in the law that says the teacher or the staff cannot go into the child's home? Is there something in the law that prohibits the use of nonprofessionals? Is there something in the law that prohibits the influence of parents on the program, that in fact says that there cannot be real program participation? All laws can be changed, but you have to make a solid assessment of the possibility of changing those laws. For example, if the question is the hours worked for school teachers, are you going to be able to change that law when its impact will be not only on the early childhood teachers but on all other school teachers? You really have to look at that kind of question and see whether people have the flexibility to do what needs to be done.

Third, you have to look at this question of the financial capacity of the organization to do the job. You can have the greatest people in the world and the greatest zealotness; but if they do not have the legal capacity and, more importantly, the influence to get the state

budget bureau and the state governor and the members of the legislature and the general public to support what they are doing — if you do not have that kind of leadership, forget it. You are just not going to move anywhere with these early childhood programs. In some cases it is clear that the education system has an advantage; its financial base is already established. In other states, unfortunately, the education system is basically in disrepute with the legislature and is not able to demonstrate that kind of competence. Again, I do not think any one organization has a natural ability to do it better than anybody else.

Another kind of question, it seems to me, is the attitude of the agency toward parent participation. Parent participation does have different meanings and there is disagreement about its proper scope. But I think there is no one today who will not argue that it is important to involve parents in one way or another — whether it means merely being present in the classroom at times or being in dialogue with the staff, or whether it means being involved in decision making about curriculum and about program and about hiring of personnel. There are all sorts of ranges that are possible there, but some institutions are inherently opposed to any of that, or will accept it only in minor degree. I do not think that kind of institution can successfully operate an early childhood program, and I would frankly seek out that institution that was most committed to a meaningful and rational involvement of parents.

I would not go to an institution that is so weak in its professional and administrative capacity that it is capable of being drummed under the table by a parent group, and particularly a parent group that may not be a representative parent group. You know, we can go too far in that direction as well. But I would clearly look for and seek out that institution that has an emotional commitment and the realistic legal capacity to be able to deal with parent involvement in a meaningful way. I would seek out the institution that shows the greatest capacity to develop a flexible program, to incorporate everything from a conventional nursery school to play groups, to working directly with parents to working with children in individual settings. I would seek out that institution that has, or can have, the kind of relationships with the other professional disciplines that will, in fact, permit them to work together — that can talk to the medical community, that can talk to the social services community, that can talk to the community action community and that can devise some effective relationships with them.

All of those things create, at least in my mind, a vision of a sort of a perfect organization that you ought to have in an early childhood program. Experience and realism tell me that you aren't going to find an agency that can do all of those things and do them well. Whatever choice you make, you're going to get some limitations. You may get a really good community action agency that seems fine, except that the

school system hates its guts and you know you will get a tremendous clash between them. Or, you may find a really good school system that the medical profession has boycotted and will not have anything to do with. You are going to have to make some choices, not on the basis of perfection but on the basis of what is the best possible development.

You are going to have to make a choice that is politically acceptable, a choice that can be sold to the legislature, sold to the governor and sold to the general public. It cannot be something that merely represents the consensus of professional early childhood judgment. It must be something that can be defended and explained to other people — and that very specifically includes explaining that this is not competitive, duplicative, overlapping and wasteful. Those will be arguments that you will face, no matter what system you try to choose, if it is different from what people have in mind.

I suspect, frankly, that some day we will come to the position in this country where the education system, as distinct from the public school system, will become the dominant force in early childhood and will provide basically this kind of service for all children. But, I want them to earn their spurs. I want them to do that by changing now, by becoming flexible now, by using other agencies as part of the system; I want them to show that they're willing to contract with other organizations, that they are willing to use volunteer organizations, willing to use community groups, willing, in fact, to develop a total education system.

• • •

Hubert Humphrey III: There is no doubt in my mind that what we are talking about — the implementing of programs — is the real crux of the political issue. It is a very tough problem that obviously must be approached and solved in different manners in every one of the states. In Minnesota, we are still continuing to face the challenge of deciding where and how to coordinate the implementation of the early childhood and family service programs. I would like briefly to go through the legislation that Senator Jerome Hughes and I and others had a part in developing and passing. Perhaps that legislation will provide an example of how one state is dealing with this question.

In the spring of this year, during the second half of our annual legislative session, which by the way was the first time that Minnesota had an annual session, we passed some experimental legislation that would establish an administrative structure and funding for six pilot projects for early identification and early childhood education. The programs, for children from birth to 6 years of age, were funded by a state appropriation of \$250,000. In addition, a state agency, the Minnesota Council on Quality Education, was designated to coordinate and to contract for the projects. This agency, I believe, meets Mr. Sugarman's criteria for having a broad range of view and a great deal of flexibility. It is a 17-member board, which is all volunteer.

Eight members represent the various professional organizations in the educational field. Eight other members are lay members, each one from a congressional district; in addition, there is one at-large appointee; these nine are appointed by the governor. Together they are the group that sponsors experimental legislation and funds experimental projects through the educational system in Minnesota. Money for those programs is funded from the legislature to the council. In a sense, this gives some flexibility within our school structure for funding through our state program.

The legislation that was passed provides for the development of programs, including identification of potential barriers to learning, education of parents in child development, libraries of educational materials, family services, education for parenthood programs in secondary schools, in-center activities, home-based programs and referral services. The programs are equally distributed: there will be two in the urban centers, two in the suburbs and two in the rural communities. Each project will serve one elementary school attendance area in the local school district. We have tried to bring the structure of the projects to the local community level of that attendance area. That does not necessarily mean that the whole thing has to be run out of that school, or out of that school structure. In fact, among the various projects there are a number that operate through organizations other than through the public education system.

The legislation also mandates that a preference be given to programs with the ability to coordinate services with other existing programs. The Council on Quality Education is required to report annually to the legislature's education committees. In addition, the legislation requires separate accounting of the funds expended on the programs, so that we in the legislature and more on the Council on Quality Education can monitor the expenditures and the results of these programs. There is an opportunity for reasonable fees to be charged, but those fees must be waived in the event that a child or a parent is unable to pay for the services.

On the state level, the council is required to appoint an advisory committee to oversee the progress of the projects. This advisory committee has already been appointed and includes a number of parents who are involved in the programs. The State Board of Education is required to give assistance in seeking funds from federal programs and federal grants and also to provide technical and professional assistance.

Each pilot program must have an advisory committee, selected by the local board of education, a majority of whose members must be parents participating in the programs. These local advisory committees must also make regular reports both to the Council on Quality Education and to another council or committee on the local level, the local Community Education Advisory Committee. In each one of our school districts, we have a lay group known as the Community Educa-

tion Advisory Committee, which develops a program for each school district for educational programs other than the formal K-12 type of school structure. This council is a very broad-based local community group. I know that is true, at least in my district, because I'm a member of that local advisory committee; we have everyone from the social services all the way to the senior citizens, the handicapped, students and many other people and parents involved in that committee. We design our own community education program and we are funded independently; so there is, in a sense, an independent structure at the local level. The pilot programs for early childhood and family services, and the advisory committee to the pilot programs, must also report to this local council so that they are aware of what the local community is doing in the project area.

Things have moved quickly since the bill was passed. The Council on Quality Education has forwarded information to every school district, informing them about the opportunity to apply for the projects. By the filing deadline, which was in the latter part of June, 43 proposals had been submitted. The council, through a series of operating meetings, has finally decided on six projects that provide a variety of services.

For example, in the city of South St. Paul, which is a suburb of St. Paul, the project involves a monthly newsletter to every family with young children, a parent library located at the elementary school, neighborhood discussion groups that frequently organize programs of their own and parenting classes sponsored by the county mental health center.

In Staples, Minn., which is a small rural farming community, the emphasis is different. It is on home-based programs and the outreach program necessary in rural communities. Staples has also evolved an assessment structure, which will be very interesting to see in operation. There is also parental instruction and demonstration, a counseling and referral program and an involvement training center. A community coordinating center brings together all the information on local early childhood and family services so that anyone interested in getting that kind of information need go only to one place, rather than tracking down all the different programs individually.

In St. Paul, an urban area project, the target population of the elementary school attendance area is low to middle income. There are four coordinating components in the program: screening and follow-through of services, a resource lending library, family education and training program, and education for parenthood.

I think that you can see by these descriptions that our legislation attempted to avoid the head-on collision between the state department of education and the department of welfare. When the legislation was introduced, there certainly was heat. It was introduced late into the session and was moved along in a rather smart way. But there are an awful lot of people who, when they see that their group or

organization or agency is not going to receive the substantial funds a program like this involves, are going to strongly oppose such a program, whether or not they are in sympathy with the concept.

The concept that we attempted to pursue here is that the emphasis must be on the community level; that if parents and other persons in the community do not understand the program and are not personally interested and involved in it, then it's not going to work in any event. So we need to coordinate and structure the program through the most local entity. In Minnesota, we have determined that that is the elementary school attendance area. I think that we are going to find out if that is really correct. That is one reason why we have designated this as an experimental project.

There are a couple questions that I think we will have to raise with regard to our legislation. First, we have to make a proper analysis of these pilot programs to determine the amount of coordination that can be accomplished at the local level and to what extent we need statewide assistance in that coordination. We need to look at how the state structure relates to the local organization and how effective it is in providing assistance.

Another question that needs to be raised is will the administrative structure, which is handled by the local public school board, hinder the supply of other child care services in the medical, social and welfare areas? We will have to see whether coordination by the local advisory council committees is sufficient to incorporate the other services that are available at the local level.

So, in review of Mr. Sugarman's checklist, I think we measure up pretty closely to his criteria. All in all, however, from a legislative point of view, I think the matter of implementation must be examined according to each state's given problems and administrative structure. In Minnesota, rather than taking on one agency or another, we have tried to circumvent the conflict by going right down to the people and to the families, to help them develop in their own community the standards and types of structures that they see as most important and necessary.

• • •

David Liederman: The subject is "organizing to deliver services." When I say "services," I mean more than just programs for early childhood development, because we need to talk about a whole range of services for young children. To me that means day care for infants and toddlers as well as for other preschoolers, and it means day care in group centers and family day-care homes and systems; it means homemaker services for families; it means counseling programs; it means family foster care for those children who need it; it means day care for all special-needs children who need it whether they are physically handicapped, retarded or otherwise severely impaired; it means day-treatment programs. We are really talking about a whole

range of services, not just building centers for early childhood development programs.

I think if we put it in that context, it is easier to deal with the business of how you organize to deliver those services, because clearly, it means that you cannot rely just on education or just on the human service-delivery system to do it. You have to put a combination system together, and whatever is appropriate, you use it. I am sure it depends on the state and the kind of machinery that state has to conduct its business and to deliver the services. Here in Massachusetts, all human services are in an Executive Office of Human Services, which includes the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Youth Services and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission and Corrections. There is a separate Executive Office of Education that includes departments responsible for public school education, higher education and education for children with special needs.

So we have two main systems in this state — education and human services — that for the first time are coming together and working together to organize a delivery system that can get the services out there to the two million children in our state who need them. The new special education law in this state, Chapter 766, which goes into effect this September 1974, mandates that every public school in the state must provide for the education of all children with special needs between the ages of 3 and 21. This clearly involves the public school system with two groups it has not previously served — the 3- to 5-year-olds and the 16- to 21-year-olds. It means that in many instances the public school system will be purchasing services from the private sector, from nonprofit groups, particularly for young children. When we talk about clinical nursery programs for the retarded or for the physically handicapped, or for other young special-needs children, clearly it would be in the interest of the public school system to buy those services from programs that are already operating programs for that group, rather than to try to develop new programs themselves. In other areas of the state, where we don't have programs in place, it might be in the interest of the local school district to try to develop and operate new programs. That is why I say I do not really care who does it, as long as we do it, as long as we get the services out there and figure out how to put them together.

I think the business of orchestrating a delivery service that is comprehensive, with the range of services I described, that is available in every area of the state for all the children who need them, is an enormous task. It is an enormous task from an administrative point of view, but an even greater task from the financial point of view, coming up with the dollars for all these services. I really believe that the only way it is going to happen in other states is the way it happened here. They will do endless amounts of planning, surveys and needs-assessment studies. They will have volumes and volumes of materials

that show how many kids need braces and how many children need to be immunized, and they will inch along with demonstration programs, which are good, such as those Senator Humphrey described.

But as I was sitting here listening, I was trying to divide \$250,000 by six programs and trying to figure out all the things that he said they were going to do in these six programs for \$250,000. I came to the conclusion that there is no inflation in Minnesota, that something different is happening in Minnesota than is happening here in Massachusetts. We are talking about lots of money; we have kids in developmental programs, special-needs programs, that cost \$12,000 a year per child.

So if you are talking about putting out a full range of services, you are talking about big money. In the long run, the political system does not really give a damn about facts and figures and needs studies and all the data; that is not the way the decisions get made. That is not to say these things are not important; I think they are. And I am not knocking planning; I think it is great and I think we should do it; but I think that in and of itself it is not going to make it happen. If Howard Schrag does a needs study in Idaho that tells me that X number of children in Idaho need this, this and that; and Barbara Moses does an assessment in South Carolina that says they need this; then it seems to me obvious that they need it in Massachusetts, too. Are the children in South Carolina or Idaho different from children in Massachusetts, or are the children in Missouri different from children in Minnesota? We know what children need; we absolutely know this already. I do not need a damned thing more to tell me what they need. I know we need to provide homemaker services; I know we need to provide counseling programs; I know we need to provide developmental day care; and I know we need to offer these services in far greater numbers than we do now, because every single program that we have in place has waiting lists. The needs are obvious, and we do not need more studies to tell us what we have to do. The real question is, how do you get the money?

The one clear way you get the money is with a constituency, because in our government, the constituencies get the money. The squeaky wheel does indeed get the grease. I think we have a lesson to learn from senior citizens. Senior citizens in this country over the last few years have done a marvelous job of organizing and making their voices heard. They have been heavily involved politically and have become very politically astute; and they are turning out some money because they got themselves organized and they are facing the politicians head on. They are saying, Hey, this is what we need. And Massachusetts has now passed the first guaranteed annual income program in this state for senior citizens. In the same way, because of the efforts of over 39 area councils for children, which now have 15,000 active members, the governor has signed a cost-of-living increase for

recipients of Aid to Families With Dependent Children, the first one they have had in four years. So when you talk about how to get the money and how to put it out there, obviously you have to have a vocal constituency.

About two years ago, Massachusetts passed a law that set up the state Office for Children. If I were a legislator, I would want to grab that thing and run with it. I think that, besides all the altruistic reasons for doing it, there is a little bit of political advantage involved as well, because it is hard for folks to be against children. And it is particularly hard for people to be against the establishment of an office for children that is going to do such great things. In setting up the Massachusetts Office for Children, one of the things that was called for was the development of 39 Councils for Children in the 39 human service planning areas throughout the state. The legislation spells out the statutory responsibilities that these councils have, including the power to review and make recommendations for approval and disapproval of funding of programs. Thus, this year's Children's Budget — which provides \$20 million in new money for children's services and which the legislature passed in July 1974 — provides for allocations of \$130,000 per council area, and each council decides which programs in its area get the money.

There is also money available to fund individual children with special needs. If a child needs a special program, the Office for Children will write a purchase-of-service contract with an agency to provide moneys for that child, and then we will try to get one of the major service agencies to pick it up once we get it going, and to keep it going.

It's been, to me, a very exciting experience over the past year and a half to see all these folks get together at the local level and give out \$5 million to start new programs — all kinds of programs, some very innovative — to expand some existing programs and to begin to set some priorities. One of the programs the office will have in place in September 1974, in 24 of the 39 areas, is a program called "Help for Children." This is a child advocacy program that consists of having staff in an office that can handle calls and help get children and their families through the bureaucracy. This program will also identify those children with special needs whom our office ought to fund, because we felt there is no one else who can handle that particular problem.

These councils now represent a constituency that is not going to be denied. These people are going to work in their own communities, they are going to come together when they have a common agenda on state issues, and I am absolutely convinced that we are going to begin to put together a state delivery system in Massachusetts that will continually put more money into all of the services that I have described.

We are close to putting together an integrated delivery system across the state so that each of those 39 areas has day care for low-

income families. The Children's Budget provides moneys to start a sliding fee-scale day-care program for working parents who are not eligible under Title IV-A. We are going to get that off the ground this year. We will also have developmental programs for young children who have special needs, family foster care available for those who need it, homemaker services available for families. When you get involved with families where there is child abuse or neglect, for example, you need someone to go in, you need someone to do some social work, you probably need homemaker services, you probably need day care, you probably need a range of things for that family.

I am not sure that our legislation fits every state, but our model seems to fit in Massachusetts. I am sure there are other models that would be equally appropriate for other states. I would urge all state legislators, agency directors and policymakers to consider taking similar action to bring comprehensive and coordinated services to all the children and families in their individual states.

• • •

Barbara Mosses: I will not attempt to tell you the story of South Carolina, but rather to offer some broad guidelines for how to deliver services. I would call it a "3-C" proposition. First, you must have Commitment. If you have commitment, then you have to establish Communications. After you've established communications, you can then establish Cooperation in order to maximize your available resources. There are many delivery systems at all levels providing services to young children. There are various delivery systems in administration, in technical assistance, in training and also in evaluation and planning. As has already been said, there are no good methods that would be applicable across the United States. You have to go back to what Mr. Sugarman said: Look at those people who appear to be the most committed to providing these services and work from there.

In South Carolina we have a little bit of all of this. We have no solid network like the one in Massachusetts. However, we have statewide delivery of services to young children through commitment, through communications and through cooperation. We have those three C's at our state and regional levels, and we have them on the very local level. We have four primary delivery systems in the state. One is the private delivery system — which includes private for-profit and private nonprofit organizations. There is a Head Start delivery system; there is a state department of education delivery system and a department of social services delivery system. All of these happen to be intermeshed and intertwined. There is no way to say you have one delivery system in any state. However, you are always going to need to have committed people involved. If you can continue to get those

three C's, then you will be able to deliver those services that Mr. Liederman says every child needs.

• • •

Ben Carmichael: I have tried to analyze our topic in a different way than the other members of the panel have. If I take our subject, "Organizing to Deliver Services: Alternative Approaches," and if you would permit me to translate that as "organizing to implement child development programs," then I wish to analyze the subject by functions that I think are required for the implementation of such programs. I am greatly concerned that, from the federal level down to the individual home and child, we establish operations that represent good management to an extent far beyond what I see in operation at this time.

I am going to define five functions. Two or three of them are very critical to us, I think. The first is common to every activity and therefore I will not dwell on it, but unless someone gives greater attention to the definition of functions that organizations are responsible for, then I think we're going to see another 50 or 100 years of insufficiency and inefficiency in the delivery of services.

The first function is common to every organization: the function of internal management, which simply means the things we do to manage the organization. There can be no organization that does not perform this function, and yet for many of us, in an office of education or an office of child development, if we really tried to determine who performs this function, how it is performed and what principles are followed, I doubt that we could really identify them.

Second, there is the function of planning and management of a state system of child development, which means that there must be a plan and a system for management of a state system of child development. Now that is partially related to an internal management system. But it also means that whatever agency is responsible for the child development program, somebody must project, take the long-range look, direct where we are going, etc. in the services we render. And the kinds of things I hear do not necessarily indicate that. I see us project-oriented, piece-mealing it, going without data, going without developed products, and so on. I would contend that we do not have in place the kind of capability that will be required to deliver what we are talking about.

The third function is the planning and management of local systems of child development — the effort at each local level to plan and manage a program of child development. If you look at organizations, you will usually find the organization at the next level up is organizing to do the work of the organization at the next level down. You will rarely find an organization defining its work in terms

of its responsibility. State departments of education never define the functions and work of state departments. They organize and work in terms of running schools, and we do not run a single school; we do not teach a single child. And yet what department of education does not have a division of curriculum and instruction? The job of the state department of education — and I use it only as an example of what is true for other organizations — is to direct the planning and management of local school systems. Its work is to lead the local school systems; that is where work is actually going to be accomplished.

If I look at the U.S. Office of Education, its organization (with all due apologies) becomes even more ridiculous. You will not find in the U.S. Office of Education, or any federal office or agency with which I have been related, any definition of functions that describes the primary responsibility that they should have to us as states. Can you find one agency that is defined and operated in terms of leading and assisting states to do the kind of things we are talking about? Invariably, they are organized in terms of actually teaching the handicapped child or the preschool child, and their interests are in individual projects spread across the country. Who is going to do the big job of helping me, as a state superintendent of schools, to build into school systems the kinds of things we are talking about? The same is true of offices of child development. What office is really organized and has defined functions in terms of helping local offices of child development? They are all talking and thinking and working in terms of individual projects instead of organizing in terms of helping the people who must do the work. I think this is most critical in the considerations before us and in the speculation on which agency should and should not be doing certain things.

The fourth function is based on the notion that we have developed the kind of organizational approach I am talking about. This function is the provision of technical services to what I call the process level of child development. That is, I have the responsibility and the function to put in place the kinds of technical services that are required by the people who are at the delivery level — the teaching level. I have a very difficult time finding among my staff people who can help in this way. I can find all sorts of people who can supervise and go out and help a superintendent plan and so on, but I cannot find anyone who, without asking any questions whatsoever, will walk in and say, "I am here and I will help you with your problem." That is technical assistance that I think is greatly needed.

The fifth and last function for us at a state level or federal level is the constant development of new practices and procedures in child development. This brings to the surface the great requirement of a strong research and development program, and we just do not have it anywhere. We are talking about things that are not proven; we cannot provide the complete directions for people to implement the programs we are talking about.

Burton White gave one of the best reports that you will ever hear in this field on research (see page). He does not go as far on development, although he makes strong implications for it. Development is an extension or use of the research data to produce programs that will achieve objectives we have in serving children. It is a tremendously tedious job. I used to live beside Union Carbide and watch its scientists try to develop a new gallon of antifreeze. The money they put into it and all the research data they had to go on made me sick when I compared it to my ability to produce a new product in education.

By this time, I have established in my state department of education a division of research and development that is greater than that in any other state department of education in this country. I have more money in it. And it is not difficult to do. Practically everything we do has, on the front end of it, resources for adequate research and development.

To introduce change, to produce new practices, I contend that you have to go outside the usual operational lines of an organization. For example, when the education of the handicapped became a responsibility of ours, I did not put it in the special education department because the department would simply have approached it in its usual way and added it to what was already going on. There is no other way it could do it. If you have the job of running something every day, you cannot stop it while you start something that demands about two or three times as much of your time. There is no way you can change the system by heaping more and more upon it. We have to move to a strong research and development capability, and we should keep a project in research and development until we know it will work. We cannot continue the process of just suggesting that we think something will work and handing it over to an agency. We need to test and prove it first.

These considerations seem to me to affect greatly how we organize to deliver services or implement programs of child development.

Families and Children: Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?

Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senator,
Minnesota

I wish to speak, very briefly, about an old subject, but one I think we have taken for granted, namely the American family. I have been privileged to serve in the Senate now for just short of a decade, and I think I have served on as many or more human-problem subcommittees as any member of the Senate. During that time, I have been on the Hunger Committee, the manpower and poverty subcommittee, the children and youth subcommittee, the housing and urban development subcommittee, the Indian education subcommittee which has expired, the education subcommittee, the labor subcommittee and hosts of others. And, in each of them we tend to look at a category: are people hungry? or, do migrants get paid enough? or, do we have bilingual education for Chicanos, for Indians? or, are civil rights being observed? or, is the proper housing being built? All these are categories, and I suppose in a sense that is necessary. But the longer I look at this problem, the more obvious it is that the central focus must be on the family, because no matter how well we do in the delivery of public and private services, there is no adequate substitute for a healthy family. If our system puts undue pressure upon families, destroying them, making it difficult for them to do their task, then an indispensable and irreplaceable aspect of raising healthy children will be gone and irretrievable. I do not care where you look; there is no substitute for the family in terms of delivering to a child a sense of love, of support, of confidence, of self-worth, of motivation and self-respect. It is the family to which we must look for our key source of ethical and moral training in this country.

Urie Bronfenbrenner, testifying last year before our Senate subcommittee on children and youth, put it this way. He said, "It is no accident that in the million years of evolution we've emerged with a particular form for raising children, and that is the human family. We should be very careful in fiddling with something that has managed to do us well so long before we even had Ph.D.'s, like myself, in child development." I think few Americans would disagree with that statement; yet, American families have come under increasing pressures in recent decades. And I am afraid we are often better at paying lip service to the institution of the family and its importance than we are at actually helping them and pursuing policies that assist them to do a better job in their work.

A few years ago, following the White House Children's Conference in Washington, we set up a subcommittee on children and youth which, to my knowledge, is the first time that the Congress has had a subcommittee with a staff that seeks to provide a forum for young people and their problems. We tried not to begin with the experts, but to hear from families and what they have to say about the problems they confront. While I think most American families are strong and healthy, I think there are warning signs that should cause concern in America that we cannot ignore. Teen-age alcoholism and drug abuse are growing problems. Suicide is the second leading cause of death for young Americans between 15 and 24. One out of nine children will be before juvenile court by age 18. One million young Americans, most of them middle class, run away each year. And child abuse is a growing and widespread phenomenon in American life.

There are some problems that don't show up in the statistics. A few months ago I was at Cornell talking to a seminar on this same issue, and in the question-and-answer period someone stood up in the back of the room and said, "All right, senator, we understand the problems of poverty, but how would you like to grow up in a family where there is great wealth but you never see your father or your mother?" And, you could feel in that room that that was the issue which had affected most of that audience. You might call it the problems of prosperity where, as one of them said, the cocktail hour had replaced the family hour.

I think the message of this is pretty clear. We cannot ignore what is happening to American families, the pressure they are under, the problems they face and the changes that are taking place. Some of the problems that families face may be unavoidable, but we must also recognize that in a host of ways, often unwittingly, government policies are placing destructive burdens on our families. Now, I do not want a Big Brother government running American families. I do not think that is the government's business. But, I do believe the government ought to pursue a course that at the very least does not interfere or place burdens upon families in their efforts to raise healthy children. In many ways I think we have gone beyond that and are in fact interfering with and sometimes making it almost impossible for some families to do their jobs.

Look at current economic policies and the inflation that is now literally a torture for families of low and moderate income. We have rising unemployment, and every expert we have talked to says that when the head of the household cannot find a job or cannot earn enough to take care of the minimum necessities of a home, that household is in serious jeopardy. The pride, the sense of authority, the whole family structure breaks down, when the capacity of a family head to find a job and to pay for the cost of raising children decently does not exist. And yet, I would bet that when the Council of Economic Advisers or the Federal Reserve Board meets, the question

of the family and the price it is paying for the twin policies of inflation and unemployment is seldom raised. Yet, in the long run, those costs may be in the hundreds of billions of dollars, just in direct economic cost.

Look at how we deal with our taxes. Take the Social Security payroll tax. That's a dandy. In the last 15 years, corporate and business taxes to the federal government have dropped by almost 40 per cent in terms of their contribution to the cost of maintaining the federal government. The individual income tax has remained about the same in terms of its percentage contribution to the cost of federal government. The payroll tax has doubled. The payroll tax is now a bigger tax for low- and moderate-income workers, in most instances, than the income tax. It is a flat tax; there are no exemptions, there are no deductions for the size of the family or for the cost of medicine or anything else. It is a flat, regressive tax. At those income levels approaching welfare, it is a tax that discourages work. And yet, that tax above all is the one that has been soaring.

Today when a low- or moderate-income family's salary rises to adjust to inflation, it just puts them into a higher tax bracket. So, not only are the dollars worth less, but they are being taxed more. And, I see little or no thought being given to the erosion of income and the devastating impact that these tax policies have today upon the family. A family earning \$12,000 last year has to earn \$13,300 this year simply to stay even. Of course, most of them have had no such increases, which is why the real purchasing power of families has dropped by nearly five per cent from last year. The real purchasing power of the average family today is actually lower than it was nine years ago.

Now, our economic and our tax policies are only one example of those policies that place pressures on families. Others that might also be included in the list are policies which unnecessarily encourage placement of children in foster homes or institutions, rather than offering families the support they need to stay together. Now, sometimes children have to be placed in those institutions, but I think many times the emphasis is on what someone called "parentectomy" rather than upon trying to provide help and strengthen that family.

Often, I think, our public housing and urban renewal policies have destroyed neighborhoods and communities or have been built in a way that is destructive to the family. Now, I am for public housing and I am for urban renewal, but I think those policies should be shaped sensitively, with the family in mind. And yet, I would bet, when the architects get together to plan one of those high-rises they never talk to a family who is going to live in one. If they ever did talk to such a family, they would never build those small kitchens. And if you talk to educators or social workers or anybody who has worked

with families, they will tell you that the notion of packing a lot of very poor people together with all of their problems has proven to be a policy that has put unnecessary burdens on families.

And yet, some of those policies continue. For example, consider the policy in public housing of separating people on the basis of age. Here in Boston in 1900, 50 per cent of the families were three-generational in the same home. Now, four per cent are. In 1900, when a young couple reared their children, grandmother or grandfather or Aunt Susie was often around, or just down the block, and they could help a young couple with the problems of early marriage and young parenthood. Now, granny and grandfather are 18 miles away in a high-rise. That kind of support and strength that the family depended upon years ago is often gone for young couples.

Another example is the transfer policies of the armed services. We had as witnesses women who testified about what it is like to raise a family in the armed services. It is quite a story. They just keep moving them and moving them. And the divorce rate and the child-abuse rate show that the breakdown of families and the pressure in the armed services is not a very nice story.

Some of our day-care policies, especially those related to work requirements of Aid to Families With Dependent Children, have too often resulted in the placement of young children in understaffed, unlicensed custodial care of the worst kind. It is one of the reasons that I fought so hard for those minimum day-care standards. Some say they are unrealistic, but I am absolutely sure that unless you put some floor under minimum day-care standards, that the emphasis in implementation would be, let's save some money, let's "serve more children," or just, let's get those mothers out working, with little or no thought given to the welfare of the children. That, too, can destroy a family.

I am not sure that when we say in Washington that it is good for all mothers on welfare to work that we are doing the right thing either. You know, my mother stayed at home with me, and I kind of fell in love with her. I think this notion that it is always best under all circumstances to crowd people onto the payroll and take them away from their children in these tender years is a very, very questionable proposition. It is one that I think we will pay a lot more for in the long run, because I think children can be damaged in those custodial, understaffed programs. Parents ought to make those decisions, not governments.

There are many things we can do to begin to change this situation. One of the steps we hope to take shortly is to introduce a notion that I hope will do some good — a Family Impact Statement, like the Environmental Impact Statement — so that when we act on governmental programs we will be required to hold a hearing to ask if this will help families or weaken them. We need to find a way to introduce into our public debates this often-forgotten dimension of the relationship of governmental policies to families.

Second, I think we need to look at tax reform and tax justice in the context of the average family. You know, we are the only Western industrial society that does not have some kind of children's allowance policy. We have, of course, the tax exemption, and it is quite a deal. The richer you are, the more you get; the poorer you are (and you have to be working, of course, to even get it) the less you get. So that under this exemption, Henry Ford is able to add about \$525 more a year per dependent to his meager budget, while the average worker is lucky to get \$125 or \$150 in real tax relief.

Now, one of the things that we tried, so far without success, was to close some of these loopholes through tax reform and then swing what we gain in revenue through this reform back into the hands of the average working family. We would do this in the form of an optional tax credit, an actual shaving-off of taxes, unrelated to your income. Our first proposal provided a choice between using a \$200 credit per dependent or continuing to use the \$750 personal exemption. Now, this would bring some relief — about \$240 — for a family of four whose income is \$8,000 a year. It would also bring more relief for large families.

We'd like to move away from exclusive reliance on the exemption system into a system that includes a tax credit option, based on the number of dependents in the family, that would really bring relief to families during the child-rearing era. I believe this is a form of relief that is long overdue.

We are also hoping to develop a bill to encourage wider experimentation with flexible working hours, so that parents can work on a schedule that is consistent with their family responsibilities, so they can develop their professional skills and increase their earning capacity while working in a way that they deem consistent with the needs of their children.

Finally, and most importantly, we need a program that offers families the kind of help and services they need for children during the early childhood years. A major part of this program must be an effort to upgrade child care available across the country. The facts in this area are well known, and there are dramatic changes under way. In 1971, 43 per cent of the nation's mothers worked outside the home compared to 18 per cent in 1948, and the number is rising. One out of every three mothers with preschool children is working today, compared to one out of eight in 1948. One out of seven children, some eight million, are living in single-parent families. That's an area that has not received sufficient attention. Many single-parent homes are having a great deal of difficulty, many of them living in near-poverty. Moreover, 65 per cent of single parents are working. Yet, there are only 700,000 spaces in licensed day care centers to serve six million preschool children, and many of those centers are in lousy shape. Ken Kenniston, director of the Carnegie Council on Children, said, "Of all

the industrialized nations, we have the least adequate public provision for the care of young children whose mothers work." A child-care program must offer other needed services as well, including the kind of prenatal and postnatal health care that will help us reduce our inexcusably high infant mortality rate.

It is indefensible the way the federal government has failed to deal with the problems of children's health. For a modest investment we could make some dramatic changes in this area. Early childhood is a time when parents and children are most in need of proper care. They need it during the time of the mother's pregnancy; they need it at the time of the delivery; they need it during those first few years after birth. And yet, that is the time when millions of people get absolutely no care whatsoever. I remember holding some hearings in migrant health down in southern Texas where a Field Foundation team of doctors had just tried to conduct what they thought was going to be a scientific survey. But they found so many sick people that they dropped the survey and just worked to try to save lives. Something like 60 or 70 per cent of the migrant mothers deliver their children with no professional care. There are other statistics utterly devastating. And yet, for a few dollars, their health needs could be dealt with and they would rear healthy children who could care for themselves instead of ending up as so many of them do, crippled, cheated children, many of them destined for welfare for the rest of their lives.

We must have part-day or in-the-home preschool educational opportunities that can make the difference between success or failure in school and life. We need to continue to work on nutrition and mental health services, classes in parenthood and all the rest.

One of the things we hope to do is to start again to move for the passage of a child and family services bill. This is, as you know, the measure which we introduced and passed overwhelmingly in the Senate and the House and which was then vetoed by President Nixon in 1971. I re-introduced a revised version of the measure this past July, with 23 sponsors in the Senate. Representative John Brademas introduced the companion measure in the House with 50 cosponsors, and next week we begin joint House-Senate hearings in Washington. This bill authorizes \$1.8 billion over the next three years to provide a wide range of child and family services. I believe you are probably familiar with the measure. It is totally voluntary. It maximizes parental control in decision making. It has a unique phase-in year for planning and training. And it seeks to serve a broad range of economic groups, with free services to families with incomes below \$8,100 and a graduated-fee schedule for families with incomes above that level.

Now this measure is not etched in stone. We want to use this remaining period and the early part of the next Congress for hearings. We are soliciting your suggestions and advice. One of the areas that has caused a great deal of controversy is the manner in which we propose to deliver services. We would appreciate suggestions about that point or any others. I am increasingly convinced that progress can be made in this area; but it can be made only if we define what it is we want, if we make a more powerful and effective case than we have; if we establish lobbies at the local and at the state and federal levels, and if we make justice for children an issue with which the political system must grapple as a priority question.

I believe that can be done. I think this country has shown time and time again that there is enormous honesty and compassion and sense of personal responsibility in Americans. And above all, Americans want to respond to the plea for fairness and justice for children. For, as the French philosopher Camus once wrote, "Perhaps we cannot prevent this world from being a world in which children are tortured, but we can reduce the number of tortured children." And, if you don't help us, who else in the world can help us do it?

Organizing to Deliver Services: The Public School System

Moderator

Barbara Finberg

Carnegie Corporation of New York

Panel

Bettye Caldwell

**Center for Early Development and
Education, University of Arkansas**

James Gallagher

**Frank Porter Graham Child Development
Center, University of North Carolina**

Donald Pierson

**Brookline Early Education Project,
Massachusetts**

Barbara Finberg: The subject of this panel is implementing child development programs with and through the public school systems. As Burton White outlined so well for us earlier, the foundations for children's physical, social, emotional and intellectual development are laid in the first six years of a child's life. He spoke about language development, about the development of curiosity, about social development and about the foundations of intelligence. We entrust the raising of our children, rightfully, to their parents; but, for this major task of helping little people make sense out of the world and cope with it, we rely chiefly on instinct, what parents may remember of their own childhood and what some parents may learn from other parents.

We do not have in the United States any institution that is universally available and geared to the unique qualities of the family and the child, between birth and 6 years of age. The medical system, if we can call it a system, attends most mothers at birth and may provide immunizations, but after that usually sees parents and children only when something has gone wrong. Not until a child is 5 or 6 does he or she enter the public school system, which is nearly universal.

But, by that time, five or six most important years have already gone by. Thinking about this lack of program, or any program that is available to all parents and children, some persons began to ask if there was some way that the schools could provide assistance, infor-

mation, support and encouragement to parents and their children in the earliest years. Three persons who are exploring what such a program might look like and whether it is feasible are the members of this panel. They direct three very different programs, each engaged with infants and young children and their parents, each closely integrated with the elementary schools that the children will later attend.

• • •

Bettye Caldwell: It is interesting to note how the term "child development" has soared to popularity in the last few years. In the disciplinary organization of colleges and universities, it used to get lost or driven out, often finding refuge in a nurtural college of home economics or living in limbo between departments in colleges. But suddenly the term is "in," and what it stands for is "in." As a consequence, some of those people in psychology are actually eating lunch with those "home ec" types, suggesting joint teaching of courses and possibly even some sharing of that ever-scarcer commodity, students.

To some extent, the term has even invaded the world of the public school, although to a significantly less degree. Many high schools now offer some sort of course in child development as part of a pre-parent or parent education. And, of course, far more public schools are now in the business of early childhood education than was the case a few years ago, operating programs under Title I of ESEA or perhaps with Model Cities money and occasionally even with locally appropriated funds. However, I know of precious few schools that describe themselves as operating child *development* programs or that describe their schools for students of any age as child development centers.

For purposes of our discussion, I am going to define child development services as a broad array of support systems to the child and the family that will facilitate the cumulative progression through life, the acquisition of competencies and attitudes that at any and all points in the life cycle enable the child to feel of consequence to himself and to others. The need for such services is probably inversely related to the age of the child, but the need remains throughout childhood. And if we were to broaden our term and speak here of human, rather than child, development, obviously we would recognize that the need remains throughout life.

For five years I have had the good fortune of being associated with an effort to demonstrate that a full array of child development programs can be centered in an elementary school. (This effort was funded from 1969 to 1974 through the U.S. Office of Child Development (OCD) and is now funded in part by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, partly by the Little Rock School District and partly by grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller

Brothers Fund.) It is my personal conviction that the elementary school is the only delivery system with anything like the universal reach needed for child development programs throughout the country, though that point of view is obviously open to debate. I would like to describe to you some of the major components of this program, offer a brief critique of how well or how poorly we feel these components have worked, discuss what I see as some of the major problems that we encountered and some that we overlooked, and offer a few suggestions to the hardy among you who would go out and do likewise.

First of all, we established an early childhood education program for children down to 6 months of age using empty classrooms in a public school. The school itself, prior to the launching of the project, was a regular Little Rock School District elementary school called Kramer, and the project became known as "the Kramer Project." Now, the aim of this arrangement was to permit continuity of development from the preschool years right through the elementary years. The Westinghouse Study and data from other early intervention projects had shown that cognitive and social gains could be facilitated through quality early childhood programs, but that these gains were often lost or attenuated after the children reached the elementary years. Our goal was to create, with the help of the school and the home, a supportive environment that would provide the experiences young children need to develop optimally during this period. Then, we hoped to facilitate whatever adaptations were necessary at the elementary level to move the child development approach upward into the elementary school.

Second, we changed the entire school into an extended day school, open from 6:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m., thus providing day care within the same facility that provided education. To make a distinction between education and day care is, to me, patently ridiculous. It is an exercise in professional discipline protection that certainly does not deserve to be associated with anything that we call a child development approach. This part of our venture has gone beautifully. In fact, it is perhaps the one child development service most closely associated with the project's identity.

Until June 1974, all of the extra components of the Kramer model were funded by the OCD grant. Beginning in September of 1974, the day care service, both preschool and elementary, will be operating with funds from Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. This will be the first time in the state of Arkansas that a local school district will be a contractor for a IV-A program. We do not know if this has been done in other states, but I think people in other states should be reminded of the possibility of this means of collaboratively funding early childhood programs.

Third, we developed a framework of cooperation between a university and a local school district. An advisory board to oversee the

project consisted of representatives from the university, senior-level research staff from the project itself and personnel from the Little Rock School District. During the five years of the project, our institutional identification has drifted away from the university and toward the school district. Quite a bit of time was required in the early stages of the project for the development of basic trust in the staff. That trust was made concrete and tangible two years ago when I, the director of the project, was made principal of the project school. That act further unified our administrative structure and immeasurably strengthened the clout of the project ideas with the elementary teachers and with the parents in the community.

Fourth, we tried to involve the families in all aspects of the project. One of our originally stated objectives was to make the school into a community school, one that the families could use for all kinds of extra school activities, one in which they would feel they truly had input. We have had group activities, discussion groups for parents of children with problems, social services to parents in their homes, home tutoring and so on. Within our particular framework, this has consistently been the most difficult objective to achieve, however. Most of our parents work and their leftover time and energy are in short supply. Nevertheless, when it looked as though we were going to run out of money this spring, our parents were our biggest boosters and repeatedly volunteered their help to make certain that the Kramer Project did not close.

Fifth, we have demonstrated that research and development can comfortably occur within a public school setting. By working very hard at avoiding a schism between teachers and researchers, we avoided the usual situations where the teachers are suspicious of "those researchers who are doing research on us." I heartily recommend one simple technique that we used. All researchers were required to spend some time working directly with the children, at recess or lunch time when the children tend to be wild and obstreperous and difficult to control or when a teacher needed to be excused for a parent conference or early in the morning when many children arrive at once, for example. It is a great way to develop empathy between researchers and teachers. We have had some stormy times in this area. Sometimes the researchers did not want to do it or claimed that they lacked the authority needed to back them up in these kinds of activities, but we have weathered those storms and the research has gone on. It is indeed possible for research to live comfortably within the setting of the public school if you integrate it with the regular school activity and do not permit it to be viewed as something that goes on outside.

Sixth, we tried to develop a sensitive health program for the school. This was essentially a failure. We, ourselves, eliminated it from the program rather than endorse an insensitive delivery system. We worked for the better part of a year trying to catalyze the develop-

ment of a clinic on the premises and to obtain pediatric aid to help us make decisions about when a child needed more serious medical attention. But when the service began, we on the project staff assessed it as being as insensitive as other kinds of medical services already available to the parents. We had assigned a precious and much-needed classroom to it and, since it did not seem to meet the needs of the families, we decided to terminate it. Next year, we hope to have a nurse-practitioner as part of our staff, half time, and we will see how that goes.

Finally, we have reorganized the student-teaching experience for the teaching interns to feature a developmental approach, the unique thing we feel we have to give to prospective teachers. No matter what age-level a student teacher might give as an eventual professional objective, we have him or her spend some time with children in all the groups in the school. We also require contact with families as part of the training experience. Next year, we will have students involved with the children as part of their preprofessional training. We would like to be able to offer an extra year of training as a true internship and hope to add this to our program in the near future.

Now to conclude with some problems we have encountered and some recommendations. Our biggest problem has been just what you would expect — money. One cannot expect a school district to add these extra developmental services without some extra financial support. Our project was funded as a five-year research project; but by about the middle of our five years, we no longer fit the OCD research priorities. We had some anxious times in there. Furthermore, a large part of our budget went for the Early Childhood Program that was regarded as service and totally apart from the research that was contingent upon that program. And we heard rumblings that the project was too expensive to continue. We remain, incidentally, eternally grateful to OCD for letting us stay alive for our first five years. But, five years is not long enough to test out the effectiveness of this kind of project. It is not even long enough to get the kinks out of the procedure.

Let me share with you some of the pearls of wisdom that I pass out freely to people these days. The top one on the list is: it is a lot harder to implement an idea than it is to generate that idea in the first place. It is easy to spin ideas, to conceptualize what you want to do. But when you try to put it into practice, you are going to break your back. You are going to be up against it all the time trying to think of new ways of dealing with the problems that come up, problems that you literally cannot anticipate until you are there in the real world of the educational system. I would say, however, we must not give up just because it is difficult.

Our second biggest problem has been one of administration. The project was essentially an administrative intrusion into an already bureaucratically burdened system. Our OCD grant went to the uni-

versity where I had a faculty appointment, which meant that all the preschool teachers were university employees and all the elementary teachers were school district employees. I had clear lines of authority with all project personnel, but the elementary teachers and the school principal had other traditional channels of authority that were real and important. This presented quite a problem which I think we did not perceive for about two years of operation, and it remained a problem until I was made principal of the school. As I look back on that situation in retrospect, I find it almost incredible that we did not anticipate that problem. If we could do it over again, I would have the money go directly to the school district. That helps more than anything to create a feeling of identity with the project. University involvement could still be sought and encouraged. A number of our big city school districts have research and development offices, and many smaller communities have enough local talent available to permit such innovative arrangements.

The last problem I want to mention relates to the personnel factor in a venture such as this. Reams have been written about the process of change, forces that resist change, forces that facilitate change. S. B. Sarason has written in his book, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, an absorbing case history of the attempts of a group of highly educated consultants to produce changes in teacher behavior and the school climate. He concludes essentially, that the more things change, the more they are the same. He also cautions that you cannot change the schools from outside the system. V. F. Haubrich has charged (in "Does the commonschool have a chance?" *Freedom Bureaucracy and Schooling*, V. F. Haubrich, ed.) that we have a system of education that has an enormous capacity to absorb change while not changing at all. The litanies about how the education bureaucracy resists change are many.

We do face something of that paradox when we talk about changing schools to make them more sensitive to the developmental needs of children. In this panel discussion, we are raising this specifically as a question: Can the schools really provide child development services? This implies that schools are not already offering such services. Such implications automatically elicit defensiveness on the part of the public school establishment.

There used to be an old joke that claimed that no one had the right to criticize psychoanalysis until one had been psychoanalyzed, by which time he or she would be so brainwashed he could no longer see anything wrong with the system. Right now I am in something of the condition of the psychoanalyzed patient. That is, I have metamorphosed into a public school person, so those stones that are thrown hurt me now. They seem to hit me much more personally. I do not want to think that five years ago I walked into Kramer school and said in effect, "Hey, you insensitive teachers and administrators, I'm here to help you humanize your program and change this expletive-

deleted old traditional school into a swingin' place with what we 'in' people call the child development orientation." Really, I did not say that, but I probably suggested those attitudes.

So, my final suggestion to those who might want to try some part of our experience is that, whatever you do, avoid that mistake. Remind the public school people that they are already speaking prose. Remind them that apart from a few private schools and health services and programs like Head Start, they might be the only people in the community offering a variety of child development services. Then, find out what resources they feel they need to elaborate and help them extend those services. Find out what kinds of help they can accept from you and other groups in the community. If you are willing to do that, I predict that the public schools, our only delivery system with the possibility of universal reach, will indeed reach out to help.

• • •

James Gallagher: My three-year sojourn in the government in Washington convinced me that the biggest missing ingredient in our business is the effective interaction of the public policymaker and the professionals in the field. The professionals need to nurture those public policymakers of all political persuasions who are interested in human beings. It is not just a matter that the children don't vote; children don't contribute to election campaigns either! If the first law of politics is survival, we need to see to it that those politicians particularly interested in programs to help human beings are in fact able to survive as well as those politicians who are interested in "things." "Things" (i.e. dams, defense contracts) bring big money into the local district as a reward. The question we have to address is, how can we reward those people who, out of their own personal convictions as much as their own profit, are trying to help our programs?

There is a story attributed to Mark Twain that involves a physician who went to his just rewards and approached the Pearly Gates. The archangel in charge went over the big book and said, "You've lived an exemplary life and, as a matter of fact, it has been so exemplary that we are able to give you any special wish that you might want to have. Do you have such a request?" The physician said, "Yes, I do. All my life I've wanted to have a chance to meet the greatest physician that has ever lived in the world." The archangel said, "I think we can deal with that. Come over here to this corner." The physician went over and looked, and he was very surprised. "But, I know that man," he said. "He wasn't a doctor. He was just a cobbler in my town." The archangel turned to him and said, "Yes, but if he had been a physician, he would have been the greatest physician in the world."

Let me discuss the work of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center (FPG Center). It was originally established in 1966 by Hal Robinson and Nancy Robinson, a very effective team of psychologists. The FPG Center is multidisciplinary, with 16 senior staff people who have appointments in various departments of the University of North Carolina.

There are two major sets of questions that the center tries to address. One of these is, what makes a competent, developing human being? We know that a young child must develop effective physical, social, cognitive, language and motor skills. We know that all of these developmental channels interact with one another. We know that the antecedents of later behavior are often hidden in a complex network of early experiences. And we know the difficulty of trying to figure out what children are like by working backwards from adult life and perspective. So, one of the tasks that we are engaged in most intensively is the attempt to observe and help a youngster's development from the earliest possible time.

One of our major projects now under way is an intensive program to try to stimulate the developmental competencies of a group of "high-risk" children — high risk being determined by the kind of family situation the youngsters find themselves in. We start as early as three months, working with the children and with their parents to try to defeat that prediction of high risk. In a nine-hour day care program, we provide stimulation in the field of language development, in the areas of motivation and contingent reinforcement to convince the youngster that the world is a predictable place in which he or she can be an effective person. We have pediatricians who are working on research in the early development of pulmonary defenses against infection in youngsters. We have people working in the area of psycholinguistic studies and in the early development of language, of cognitive style and of the family dimensions that are particularly relevant to the early development of youngsters.

We are committed to the notion of longitudinal research and to the notion that if you really want to understand children, it is better to study 20 or 25 children intensively over time than to look at 300 children once or twice with the aid of standard observations or tests.

Because longitudinal development is not linear and not easy to predict, one has to follow the various twists and turns that early development takes in order to understand which forces are really crucial to that early development and which forces are merely complementary to it. In relation to this concern, we are beginning a major curriculum development effort. We will try to bring the best that we know from theory and the best that we know from practical experience and put them into some kind of a blend to create a sequential developmental curriculum that can be used by anyone who is working on developmental skills, whether that person is in a day care center, a home visitor program or some kind of school setting.

Now, the second major question that we're most interested in at the Frank Porter Graham Center is how to bring knowledge to the practicing professional. To do this, we're involved in two large technical assistance programs. The first of these is called TADS (Technical Assistance Development System), a service program to a nationwide group of a hundred centers sponsoring early childhood demonstration programs for preschool handicapped children. We try to work with each of the centers on the problems that they identify as the most important to them. I agree with Ms. Caldwell that you have to start where the people are and the problems that they are concerned with, if you are going to do them any good. So we are working directly with those centers to help them in fields such as program planning, evaluation, curriculum development — whatever aspect they feel needs strengthening in their demonstration program.

The second area of technical assistance is the Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System designed to assist the state developmental disability councils established by law to do long-range planning for children with developmental disabilities. Many of these state councils lack expertise in certain technical areas, and our responsibility is to help each of these councils in those areas where they feel they need special assistance. We have just established a third program in cooperation with the University of Kentucky and George Washington University to provide help on a regional basis in Maryland, Virginia, District of Columbia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Delaware, Tennessee and Kentucky. We offer special assistance for programs with handicapped children in that area, with particular emphasis on early childhood and in program planning.

One of the distinctive features about this last arrangement is our unusual compact with the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Schools to exchange land and buildings. We are, therefore, on the physical site of a public school building. We have a cooperative arrangement that includes, among other things, the cooperative running of an open education, multi-age kindergarten for 60 youngsters on the first floor of our building. We also participate in a variety of research projects involving the school, including studies of the impact of open education on the behavior of certain children.

I approach the problem of how well the schools operate and what the schools' participation should be in early childhood from a consistent standpoint. If you ask are the schools ready to incorporate new early childhood programs, my answer is "No." Can they be? The answer is, in my view, "Yes." We have already demonstrated that it is possible for the schools to expand and extend their responsibilities and take on responsibilities that 10 or 15 years ago we thought they were not able to do. For example, in one area of handicapped children, they have brought in many different professions that the schools had never really dealt with extensively before. Over half of the states now have legislation that either permits or mandates programs for handi-

capped children beginning before the entrance of school age, and many of the states are actively developing programs connected with the schools for youngsters down to age 1, 2 and 3, who are deaf or have cerebral palsy, who have a variety of handicapping conditions. We are following the very good child development principle that the earlier you start, the more effective your programs are going to be.

It is very easy to get frustrated with bureaucracies, and it is very hard to change them. One of the questions that we have to ask ourselves is, if we are not going to try to reform the schools, what is the alternative? The alternative is setting up some kind of a separate bureaucratic system. You cannot compare the bureaucratic complexities of an organization that is trying to take care of fifty million children in the United States with small excellent demonstration programs that are providing services to a small group of young children. One fact that is overwhelming to me is that if you walk down the street of your city and you pass 100 people, by the law of averages one of those is going to be an elementary or secondary school teacher. There are about two million elementary and secondary school teachers in this country; 1.2 million of that number are elementary school teachers. That is a lot of people; that is a lot of jobs to fill with competent, exciting and dynamic people. Sometimes the jobs have to be filled whether or not you have an exciting, dynamic person.

The question is not, can I run one or two brilliant demonstrations to show what I can do with children? The real trick is to extend that kind of service over large numbers of children. To contemplate an alternative system to education and the schools means contemplating not just working with 10 or 20 professionals, but setting up a vast new system of thousands of professionals. The schools have the advantage of the physical plant, they have the advantage of public fiscal support.

When I was in the federal government, the federal government was contributing six cents on the dollar to the total costs of education. The long-range plans that I have seen assume that that amount will go up to 20 per cent or 25 per cent sometime in the next 10, 15 or 20 years. I think that that is reasonable. That will provide the fiscal support that will be necessary to do the kinds of jobs that we want the school system to do. I do not think it is necessary that all of the exciting things take place in the schools; as a matter of fact, sometimes it is easier to do exciting new things outside the boundaries of the schools. But, the schools will see them, they will take note of them and they will incorporate them, slowly and perhaps too slowly, for some of us, but they will do it.

Let me make one point about research. One of the things that became clearer as we tried to look at the 1-, 2-, and 3-year-olds, is that we know next to nothing about the integrated and sequential development of youngsters in that age period. All we have is the accumulated experience of experts who observe intelligently and give you their best

judgment on what they think is happening. That is good, but it is not good enough.

Take the state of North Carolina; less than one-half of one per cent of the money allotted for day care or for education goes toward research, toward trying to find out how to do the job better. Somebody in Washington once told me, "If you want to know what is really going on, don't pay attention to the rhetoric; go to the budget and find out where the money is being spent. That is what tells you what is really going on."

So we have people complaining that the school systems are not doing their job, that day care is not doing its job, yet we are spending less than one penny out of every dollar trying to find new and better ways as to how to do it. If you are seriously concerned about child development and early education, then why not put the same amount of money into this field as we now put into medicine and agriculture and business. If we spent as little money on tobacco research in North Carolina as on education, the tobacco farmer would be out of business in 10 years. If we put as little money into research and development in General Motors as we put in education or day care or child development research, they would be out of business in 10 years. Businesses know what works; they know that if you make a major investment in finding systematic ways to do the job better, you get payoff from it. That is something we have not learned in the field of human resources and that we have not committed ourselves to.

• • •

Donald Pierson: The Brookline Early Education Project (BEEP) has been in operation on a pilot basis for about a year and a half. It operates as part of the Brookline Public Schools. It is funded for the first two years of operation by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. Our purpose is to determine the benefits of providing comprehensive, diagnostic and education services to families beginning before the birth of their child and continuing through to the entry of public school kindergarten. We are presently providing services to 262 families who have had infants born since March 1973 or were expecting before the end of September 1974. The program is open to all residents of Brookline, as well as to black and Spanish-speaking residents of Boston. In recalling the experiences of a year and a half, I made a list of about a dozen inter-related and overlapping considerations. These considerations may help others who are planning to start similar programs.

The first consideration is that despite the years of planning that went into the BEEP operation, the involvement of many school personnel, the creative ideas of Burton White, the involvement of

medical personnel and the involvement of community personnel, there has been much to learn in moving from planning to implementation. The day-to-day operation of being involved with a wide range of families can only be learned by trying; the preliminary planning is never entirely adequate.

A second consideration is the question of grandeur versus gradualism. In moving toward a comprehensive early childhood program, you need to consider whether to implement multiple dimensions at once for as large a group as possible at the beginning or whether to try to move in successive phases with preliminary planning, pilot studies and staff training. There are many arguments on both sides. I would characterize our approach as being slightly more toward gradualism. We are starting only with newborns, instead of taking children throughout the prekindergarten years. We are starting on a pilot basis, limiting the total group to about 285 families. A rule of thumb we have tried to follow is not to do anything unless we can do it well. We continually reexamine our total staff capacity before starting up a new program. For instance, one of the compromises that we made in starting out was to start with just one neighborhood center, to run that well and to consolidate our staff there. In the process, we have provided more free transportation for parents to help them get to the center than would otherwise have been necessary, but our decision was to start with one demonstration center and to move out from there.

I see two important risks in the gradualism approach. One is the need for continuity of funding to complete the pilot phase and move toward the total operational phase. It is unrealistic to expect public schools to commit enough funds at the outset to move completely in this direction. A second risk is introduced when the process of planning is extended over too many years; the individuals initially involved may leave and those who follow may not have either the same aims or the necessary zeal and commitment. So there are two sides to the question of scale.

A third consideration is staff selection. In selecting staff who will be working closely with parents, we feel that the academic credentials are often not as important as empathy with parents. We have felt so strongly about this requirement during the infancy phase of our program that we have required that teaching staff have not only a background in child development and experience in working in the field, but that they also be parents themselves.

Another factor we emphasize in staff selection is the fact that the values, the racial and ethnic mix of the staff, as well as their language background, should reflect that of the participating families.

Another concern, overlapping with staff selection, is the style of support that staff can give to families. The rhetoric that we use among our staff is that we see ourselves as "resource persons" rather than as "experts" in working with families. We see our teacher-home visitor

role as one of being able to brainstorm with parents, to help parents come up with additional ideas, insights and options about ways in which they can gain new confidence and enjoyment in working with their children. We feel that there is a significant risk, in sending someone into the home or in meeting with parents, of undermining the parents' confidence in their role. We have to be careful not to introduce new anxieties about their competence and especially not to aggravate the anxiety about school achievement that many parents feel when their children reach age 5 or 6, and some parents feel when their babies are still newborns.

Another area also related to staff considerations and staff development is the kind of staff support and quality control that one builds into the program. It is very important to try to set a non-threatening, collaborative tone in which staff members work as a team, in which they feel that they have something to offer as well as to gain from being open about the way in which they operate with other staff members. The team approach assumes two or more heads might be better than one in planning a program. If we don't follow this approach, I think we risk creating a situation where everyone declares, we do "what's good for kids," yet that might mean very different things to different people. Since I do not think any of us are ultimate authorities on what is good for kids, I think one way of being more assured that we are offering the best possible program for children and their families is to rely on more than one person in that contact with families.

A sixth consideration for our program has been how to involve families in the program—our recruiting efforts. This is an area that has taken much more of my efforts and of our total staff efforts than we initially anticipated. By having the program open to all residents of the community of Brookline as well as to all black and Spanish-speaking residents of Boston, we knew that education-oriented families would quickly seek us out as soon as there was any local publicity. But our requirement of attempting to recruit families prenatally, before the child is born, has made it even more difficult to seek out families who are not education-oriented, who are not likely to recognize the needs for support until perhaps the child is a few months or even years old. Their expectations and feelings of need may be very different from those of the professionals. So we have invested a great deal of our effort in recruiting these families and have been very fortunate in gaining the help of community agencies and schools, obstetricians and pediatricians in the community in referring families to us.

We have felt that it has been important to us to continue to attempt to recruit prenatally because this has offered us an opportunity to build rapport with families in a nonthreatening way, to offer families an opportunity to develop a clear understanding of what our program has to offer, to realize that it is not a substitute for day care,

that it is not a substitute for their ongoing medical care, but that we intend to work closely with their public health center or pediatrician in providing that. If you are planning to start a program that begins before birth or as early in one child's life as possible, I would urge you to spend time building your contacts with people in the community to ensure that families who might need the services most will be participating from the outset. I might add that our most effective recruiters, by far, have been the families who began participating early in the program and had children born during the spring and summer of 1973. We continued to have difficulties recruiting until these families gained enough experience so that they could convey to others not only how valuable and important they found the program, but how much they enjoyed coming over to the BEEP center and being with their friends, just playing in the play room with their children or with staff. We really have not had to urge parents to go out and sell the program to other expectant parents because they have done it themselves. It takes patience and time, and our recruiting period has extended longer than we had initially anticipated, but I think that is because we needed to build confidence in the community first.

Another need is for interdisciplinary collaboration. We have felt from the outset that the medical input, in particular, is very important in helping children gain an optimum start in life. We have felt that pediatricians have a great deal to learn from educators and educators have a great deal to learn from pediatricians. Our collaboration with pediatricians from Children's Hospital Medical Center here in Boston has been very gratifying. They have worked very closely with us in planning the health and developmental exams, and they have come to realize the gap in their own training. Particularly during infancy and increasingly into the elementary school years, parents rely on their pediatrician and public health center for advice with regard to their child's learning ability and style. Yet pediatricians tend to have very little or no training in child development and their advice is sought solely because of their special position of expertise within the community rather than any special expertise in child development. Consequently, we have found the pediatricians with whom we are working to be particularly interested in gaining more insight into child development. In addition, because we do not provide total health care, the collaboration of our pediatricians has been very helpful in developing a close working relationship with the family's pediatrician and with area back-up agencies.

The importance of parent participation in program planning and policy issues is an area that I think is beyond dispute. You have to gain the participation of the parents in order to make sure that your program is responsive to their needs. But you have to keep in mind that sometimes the parents who are first to be involved in the planning, who volunteer for committees and who can be available for the daytime meetings, which are most convenient for staff members, may

not be the most representative parents of your group. It is important to try to achieve parent involvement through many different channels of communication. For instance, we have a newsletter, a suggestion box and opportunities for frequent informal gatherings. There are tie-dye sessions or toy-making sessions that are often mainly just a social excuse for parents to get together, but which often serve as a starting point for a new direction of parent involvement and policy planning.

Here, briefly, are some final considerations. Keep in mind the truth-telling issue—the need to help parents be as well informed as possible about their child's pattern of health and development and, at the same time, the need not to raise unnecessary anxieties by, for instance, giving them very soft medical information that has unknown prognostic significance. This is an ethical issue that has consumed a great deal of our time.

Also keep in mind the need for documentation and evaluation: documentation because the paper model often evolves to be something very different when the model is in operation. I think that extensive record-keeping can help keep one on the track.

Finally, I would submit that one continually needs the unwavering support of the administration within the schools. We have felt that it is important for school personnel to view BEEP as a school program. Consequently, we have taken much effort to involve school principals, curriculum directors and elementary school teachers in planning the program. In Brookline, the superintendent of school, Robert Sperber, regards BEEP as his most important professional endeavor to date. Moreover, it helps immensely to have the collaboration of key school people in working through and around the very frustrating mechanisms of the Civil Service bureaucracy.

Day Care and Cost Effectiveness: A National Overview and a Case Study

Moderator

**John Niemeyer, President Emeritus,
Bank Street College of Education, and
President, Day Care and Child Develop-
ment Council of America, Inc.**

Panel

**Richard Ruopp, Vice President, Human
Development Area, Abt Associates, Inc.,
and Director of the National Day Care
Study 1974-77 for the U.S. Office of Child
Development**

**Mary Rowe, Special Assistant to the
President and Chancellor, Massachusetts
Institute of Technology**

**Irma Garay, Director, Children's Pump
House Day Care Center, New York City**

**Gardenia White, Training Consultant,
Children's Pump House Day Care Center,
New York City**

**Jacqueline Monthe, Member of the
Classroom Staff, Children's Pump House
Day Care Center, New York City**

John Niemeyer: In tackling the question of costs, we are going to take two approaches. First we will start with Mary Rowe and Richard Ruopp, who have been working on day care cost accounting, in terms of quality and program. Then, in addition to this broad approach to the topic, we will try to relate the question of costs to the services and program of a particular day care center — the Children's Pump House Center in New York City. I am always troubled by the fact that in

meetings like these we talk about such topics as costs and programs and delivery systems, and yet many in this audience, particularly those who are devoting all their efforts to state legislation, may have never seen a day care center. Our purpose, then, is to give a human and realistic dimension to these abstract topics.

So we will turn first to Mr. Ruopp and Ms. Rowe for an overall view of costing, and then to the director of the Pump House Center, Irma Garay, and to two members of her staff, to discuss exactly how an actual center is organized and run to provide support to children and their families.

• • •

Richard Ruopp: Mary Rowe and I are going to focus our remarks primarily on full day care for preschool children. While we are not excluding after-school day care, and other kinds of part-time day care, the core issue is providing care for children of a working parent, or working parents, for the full course of their employment, whether it be nine-to-five or swing-shift or even graveyard shifts. That means approximately 2,250 hours of care for a child during a year, roughly 30 per cent more time than children spend each year in public education. The magnitude of the issue is large. Depending on whose estimates in 1974 you are looking at, there are probably 3.2 million to 3.5 million children under 6 years of age whose mothers or parents are employed full-time. Probably only 50 per cent to 60 per cent of those 3.2 million children are cared for by unpaid neighbors, aunts, uncles or other extended-family members. Probably about 30 per cent are in some kind of formal, paid-for, child care arrangement; roughly two-thirds of this latter group are in day care homes, and the other third receive care in centers. In addition, 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the children in that age group continue to be left on their own during the course of the day.

Thus, there is a large number of children for whom we are already spending large amounts of money. The 1974 fiscal federal obligations for all forms of early child care amount to slightly over \$1 billion. The IRS estimates child care deductions at another billion, although that's a somewhat debatable figure. So, approximately \$2 billion in federal funds, plus state Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) matching and Work Incentive Program (WIN) funds, probably brings it up closer to \$3 billion in current public expenditures alone. In addition, there are large amounts of parent expenditures.

For the purpose of this discussion, we see day care as serving four groups. First, it certainly serves parents. Good day care that takes care of children during a parent's working time meets an essential need of an important segment of the population. Second, it serves children during the hours that they are not tended to by their parents

or parent surrogates. Third, it serves staff members (an issue that often goes unnoticed) in terms of employment and in terms of the quality of staff life. And fourth, it serves the community by meeting a public responsibility for caring for the children of the population as a whole. As a parent who has used child care, as a quasi-staff member in the day care area and as a member of the community, I see all those needs as critical. I will say my bias is in favor of the children; so when we are talking about costs, it is clear that children come first, costs come second.

Day care, as we said, serves children through home care, through center care, through babysitters and through extended families. Over the last eight years, considerable controversy has developed. Essentially, four camps have grown up in the world surrounding day care policy. There is the "cost reduction" camp that suggests we should spend zero dollars annually on day care, that the place for children is in the home being cared for by a parent, preferably a woman. There is the "universal day care" notion, that advocates free or nearly free care for anybody who wants it in the United States, which according to Mary Rowe's last estimate would add an extra \$40 billion a year to the national budget. And there are, if you will, the "perfect day care for some children" advocates who believe we should spend \$5,000 a year for each child even if we serve only 50,000 children, making sure that each child gets every possible advantage during the course of a day care experience.

All of us, at various times, tend to be advocates of one or more of these four positions, depending on the political climate, the availability of funds and so on. But I believe that, from a public policymaker's point of view, it is reasonable to talk about the greatest good for the greatest number of families, within available budgets. Now Ms. Rowe will address some of the issues of cost analysis connected with this fourth view of public policy in day care.

• • •

Mary Rowe: Anybody who lives in Mr. Ruopp's camp 4 — that is, who wants to serve as many children as possible as well as possible with budgets that depend on other priorities — sooner or later comes to wish that we could do a traditional, classic cost-benefit analysis that would prove once and for all that programs for children are worthwhile. Because this question comes up so frequently, let me speak for a moment about why such an analysis cannot easily be used to justify children's programs.

The traditional analysis, ideally done, would look rather like this: First, it would be a long-term as well as a short-term analysis. But for many reasons, it is extremely difficult to demonstrate long-term benefits from children's programs. Perhaps the most important reason is just that such programs comprise only part of the inputs to a

child's life and you are therefore testing variance in a small theme. In fact, of course, you cannot demonstrate the long-term benefits of any kind of education very well. We would not have public schools if we insisted on that philosophy.

Another major reason it is difficult to do the traditional analysis is that a good cost-benefit analysis must reckon damages as well as benefits to large populations. Most cost-benefit analyses that have been attempted with children's programs deal only with benefits or only with damages, but not with both together. Another major problem is that researchers fail to specify which population they are evaluating for benefits. Ordinarily, people look only at the benefits or damages to children, ignoring what happens to parents, staff and community. On the other hand, the Nixonian approach looks only at benefits to the community, leaving out benefits to children and parents, if any. It is difficult, but it would be necessary, in a good cost-benefit analysis, to consider *all* those benefited.

This brings us to the next question: Who is going to do the analysis? I recently ran across a learned, careful cost-benefit evaluation of child care programs, reckoning the effects on children, that began with a statement by the writer saying he had long cherished the opinion that parents in paid employment are a principal source of damage to children. Now, I submit that the writer is likely to find what he is looking for. So a major consideration in doing these evaluations is who is doing it on behalf of whom.

The next problem is what the economists would call a "problem in coinages," that is to say, the question of the different types of benefits a child care program provides. There is the happiness of children; there are the dollars earned by parents; there is the tremendous expansion of jobs for staff. Those are apples and oranges that are very hard to reckon together. Because of that, a program that is started for one purpose may be evaluated in terms of totally different aims. Head Start, for example, was started to improve the self-image of children and to break the poverty cycle, but it was evaluated in terms of the cognitive gains of the children. The apples and oranges, the coinage problem in evaluation, is usually thought to be insurmountable for the cost-benefit analysis of human services.

Just to run very quickly through other problems in accurately analyzing the costs and benefits of a day care program: A good evaluation should look at "opportunity costs," that is, what would happen without this program. You are evaluating this program with respect to what alternatives? A staff-child ratio of 1-to-45 for infants in an Indian reservation may look horrendous until you realize that those children used to be left in the backs of locked cars. If you look, therefore, at the actual alternatives, your program may look very good indeed. Then there are all the indirect effects of child care programs. There are the interaction effects: helping the child helps the family, which helps the program, and so on. There are the unexpected effects

that nobody tests for because they weren't looking for them in the first place. And there are the many problems just of measurement, in measuring different kinds of gains. We do not yet know how to measure accurately just the gains in the cognitive areas, much less in the areas of social and emotional development. And we do not regularly report ranges of results. For example, what may happen in many child care centers is that 10 per cent of the children are enormously benefited, but these gains are not clearly evident when you look only at the overall, average results.

For all these reasons, then, the traditional cost-benefit analysis that everybody would like, if they are going to be in the "policy camp 4" that Mr. Ruopp described, is just impossible. What, then, do we do in order to justify ourselves in the eyes of the world? Most of us think that cost-effectiveness analysis of one kind or another is probably the answer. Here, again, there are two possible kinds. One is the "constant cost" cost-effectiveness analysis, which asks, "For a given amount of money, say \$100,000 a year, what can a center produce operated at its most efficient level?" The second approach is the "least cost" option, which asks, "We want a center of a certain kind — how can we produce it at the least cost?" Child care people are regularly in the first camp. They say, give us the money and let us see what we can do with it. Legislators of the Nixonian variety are regularly in the second camp. They say, what is the minimum that kids can survive with and how can we produce that most efficiently?

I think that all of us who have ever run a child program will be sturdily in that first camp and for two very specific reasons. The first is that the variation in child programs that is desirable is rivaled only by the variation among children — different children need different programs. Second, to say that we want a specified program and then try to figure out how to produce that with the least amount of dollars completely ignores the different sources of resources around the country, in urban and rural areas, in inner-city and suburban areas, and so on.

What has our research team done with these difficulties? Faced with this intellectual conundrum of how to demonstrate cost effectiveness, we decided to find out what different individual programs can actually do with a tiny amount of money. Our first attempt in 1970-71 was to go out to 20 centers and systems with an aggregate of 6,000 children and just see and describe what good programs looked like and how they spent their money. The second attempt was a refinement of that first. It happened this last year in Maryland, where we described and analyzed what happens in an entire state system

and tried to establish some careful measurements of cost effectiveness.

...

Richard Ruopp: Before we examine some of the critical issues that states must face in establishing their own day care programs and making decisions about their future investments in day care, let's look at some of the facts that will define the field for the next five years.

First, day care centers are on the increase by about 10 per cent per year, with a shift from part-time to full-time day care, indicating an increase in demand, and we estimate that this growth will continue. Second, the declining birth rate may actually promote an increase, rather than a decrease, in day care for several reasons. One, the nuclear family, as it gets smaller, will need more and more to have group experiences that used to be provided by larger family groups. Third, if you have only two children, it is easier to make arrangements for all of them than if you have six. Fourth, if you have only two, you may have a bit more time that you want to invest in other things, and day care arrangements provide that possibility. In addition, increasing employment options, particularly for women, will also have an impact on the need for child care. It is estimated that possibly 50 per cent of the female population will be in the labor force by 1980.

The reason the push is going to be toward formal or monetized child care, of course, is that the nonmonetized supply continues to dry up — partly because more and more people are working; partly because many of the people doing it, the aunts and uncles and grandmothers, will not be around that much longer, or will themselves be in part-time employment and not available. The continuing pressure for welfare reform, the reintroduction of the Brademas-Mondale bill for child and family services indicate that there will be continued public pressure for some kind of public day care provision. Moreover, many parents are willing to pay at least part of the cost. For example, if you stop to think that a family may require up to 2,250 hours of child care, and if you have to pay \$1 an hour for a babysitter at home these days, that could mount up to \$2,250 a year for a family to buy child-sitting service out of their own pockets. If they have an alternative costing \$2,000 a year or less, and it is still tax deductible, they may choose center or family home day care over the individual babysitter.

Besides all these reasons for the growth of day care demands, some of us take the view that, since children are our country's most important natural resource, it is wise to be investing in that natural resource. Perhaps it is even more important than energy conservation

and pollution abatement since, presumably, we want somebody around who knows how to use the world in the future.

• • •

Rowe: One of the things we are frequently asked is, what are the most critical factors for the development of good child programs on a state level? I have four rules of thumb. Rule of thumb No. 1: The backing for your child programs must be bipartisan and widely based at the local level. That is to say, you need to conduct regional meetings all over the state; you need regularly to bring together local groups of all kinds to talk about children's programs, part-time and full-time day care and other kinds of child care and after-school care. It must be put on a bipartisan basis. That is item one.

Item two is that you need a survey. You can't get anywhere politically unless you know what is being supplied, for how much money and what people want. Of these two questions, supply and demand, the second is the more important. Legislators are regularly astonished that parents all over the map are ready to vote state moneys for programs for children, and that lots of nonparents are also ready to vote state moneys for these programs. People who conduct day care surveys regularly find that the interviewers are kept for four hours instead of one, with their ears being talked off, and that in national and state and regional polls the taxpayers want children's programs. So, rule No. 2 is, do a survey — what have you got and what do your taxpayers say they want?

Rule No. 3 is the "warm body" rule. You need a half a dozen people who are committed to child care full time, who are warm, able and can work full time at it for a period of at least two years. It can be done through children's lobbies, an office for children or dedicated volunteers; but you have to have a small group of people around whom others coalesce.

And, finally, rule No. 4: you need a resource search. The watchword for funding children's programs is that the resources always come from multiple sources. Many uninformed people think day care funding must come only from the federal government, but the facts are that the government funds child care programs to the tune of about 50 per cent and the other 50 per cent comes from many, many people — in-kind donations, state programs, churches, unions, all kinds of other community groups. So, rule No. 4 is do a resource search based on the proposition that there will be multiple sources of resources.

• • •

Ruopp: If I were a legislator in 1974 and wanted to support the development of a more rational approach to day care in my state, I

would probably do something like the following: First, I would recognize that the quality-quantity issue is likely to be the nub of a lot of the controversy, and I would try to figure out for myself what that means and take my own position on it. With respect to quantity: Who is to be served and by what kind of programs? Is it going to be only parents who need full-time care? Is it going to include parents who need part-time care, after-school care, etc? This is one of the issues that has to be dealt with because the associated numbers become critical in terms of costs. Of course, the greatest good for the greatest number of people is historically not a bad platform to stand on.

On the quality side, we are still facing a conundrum. As Ms. Rowe points out, we still do not know how to measure good outcomes for children that we know will endure after the children move out of preschool into the benign or corrosive or supportive environment of public education, depending on your value position. We do not know exactly what should be measured. There are a variety of views about affective measurement, cognitive measurement, happiness indexes, warmth indexes and so on. So, measuring quality becomes difficult, but I believe that it can be done better now than it could a few years ago.

When we did a study of publicly funded day care in the state of Maryland we tried to ask the question as a legislator might ask it: What is a wise investment of public funds in day care? What constitutes, from a consumer point of view — that is both the public and the legislature — a “best buy”? Instead of trying to define “best buy” day care by depending on expert opinion or advocacy camps in the day care world, we went out and tried to find a number of day homes and centers that, on process measures — such as the quality of the staff (director, teachers, and non-care staff), the quality of interactions (between staff members and children, and between staff members and each other), the quality of program (for children, for parents, for staff), the quality of the support program, and the quality of plant materials — seemed to measure up in a way that people with good common sense would say, “This is a place I want to put children for nine hours a day.” Now, that is not terribly sophisticated. It does not have the advantage of multiple regression runs on a computer and so on, but in 1974 I think I would be satisfied, as a legislator, with a systematic look at those things that people can still agree seem to be good processes for children — warm, healthy, educational care that we believe certainly will not damage children and may prove to their long-term benefit.

When we found centers in Maryland that met our quality standards, we then looked at their cost and we found some centers that were delivering quality care at reasonable costs. We then defined an empirically based “best buy” standard from which we could derive some rules of thumb for the state of Maryland to assess what it should be paying for contracted purchase-of-care arrangements, and what it

could expect a reasonable range of quality to look like.

Until we have ways of measuring what happens to little children, until we have some commonly accepted definitions and instruments that have been tested nationally, we are going to have to continue to take a look at the actual treatment, the process, that children undergo. Therefore, the day care director and the care givers themselves continue to be probably the most positive index of publicly approved quality care for children — a nonabusive, warm, reasonably happy environment. There is nothing wrong with a child who is happy every day, even if one has not made a life-long contribution to getting him into Massachusetts Institute of Technology. We think quality can be measured, at least at that level, and we think it is important to be able to do that, systematically, across a number of centers. A state can develop its own day care quality priority system and get its own act together and use its day care directors and experts to set values around those quality priorities.

• • •

Rowe: I'll assume for the moment that you have measured quality, though I would like to associate myself with what Mr. Ruopp said: The years from birth through 14 represent one-fifth of that child's lifetime, and that age group represents one-fourth of our entire population; so if all you do is make the children happy from birth through 14, you have already done more than any other national program we know about. I personally can justify child care without ever seeing a "long-term benefit."

Back to costs. Let me say at the outset, there is nothing mystic about costs. Why costs vary as they do — between \$500 a year for kindergarten in Massachusetts to \$4,500 a year for a preschool program in New York City — is very well understood. This is partly just because child care costs are 70 per cent to 80 per cent dependent on the people in a program. Reported costs for preschool programs regularly vary between about \$2,000 and \$5,000 per child per year for various other reasons, however. Of these reasons, the most important are prices. That is, prices for the same program vary around the country by a factor of about 100 per cent between Mississippi and inner-city New York, and they vary every year, partly due to the increasing unionization of child care workers. In addition, inflation in child care costs has been at least 10 per cent per year since 1970.

A major problem on costs is, how do you get the data? This is no trivial question. On our telephone surveys to day care directors we regularly find that the answers we get from well-informed directors differ from the real data by as much as 50 per cent, mainly because overworked directors do not realize how many community resources they have actually recruited for their programs. So, just getting the

data on real costs is a steady, hard-work project that requires a couple of days per center. Please use standard forms when you do it. Standardizing the forms means prorating your program as if it were something on the order of 250 days per year, 9 to 10 hours per day, with a standard number of holidays. Unless you have put a budget into standard form, it is not possible to compare your budget to anybody else's.

Another major cost question is the difference between enrollment costs and average daily attendance costs. Somewhere between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the variation in reported child care costs among similar programs is due only to the fact that enrollment and average daily attendance vary so much and that some centers report on one basis, some on another. On the average, there is at least a 10 per cent difference between enrollment and attendance, and in centers where children come by transportation the difference may be as much as 25 per cent. This is very important in planning for child care programs because if you are going to have a 25 per cent difference between enrollment and average daily attendance you probably should over-enroll by your factor of absenteeism.

In order to reckon child care costs for a given program, all of the figures must be in full-time equivalency units of hours per year for both staff and children. It is only when you have those figures that you can begin to reckon what is actually happening in a program.

But of all the factors that are of critical importance in reckoning child care costs, the one that is probably most important (especially in costing excellent programs) has to do with in-kind donations. In a center like the Children's Lump House Center, for instance, if you look only at the approved budget and only at the number of children, you might find that the cost per child per year is somewhere between \$4,000 and \$4,500. However, if you then look at the services that are actually provided to the families and children, if you look at the number of service hours actually delivered by that center, you might find almost twice the number of child care hours. That is, probably twice as many service hours are delivered as are paid for.

If you look at extra inputs you will find, in addition to what shows up on the standard budget, at least the following: a family counseling program; medical and dental programs with testing, psychological testing and remedial work; an extraordinary food co-op, which not only provides food at probably an average of 30 per cent to 40 per cent lower than in the stores, but also teaches nutrition; an extraordinary baby-sitting service which does not show up on the budget at all (because it is entirely in-kind) but which contributes, for 32 families, at least 1,000 baby-sitting hours per year. There is a staff training program; an elaborate program of home visits that would include even hospital visits where somebody in the family is sick; job counseling, job finding.

On the record it looks as though Pump House has 2,580 staff

hours per year, but those are only the paid hours. The staff, in addition, works at least 400 or 500 hours per year overtime, and at least another 100 hours per year in their own training. There are at least 1,000 volunteered hours that do not show up on the budget, and the director works an average of 60 hours per week. I am sure that does not include the weeks where she also works 70 or 80 hours. The total in-kind donation would, by my estimate, show up as about a 30 per cent increase on the budget of real resources used.

If, taking all of these factors into consideration, I then worked out a real cost per child per year for direct services to children, that cost might drop from \$4,500 to something like \$3,000. And if I were to cost-out the "human service hours" per year provided to children and families associated with the center, the cost might easily drop to \$2,000 per year per child. So, the costing question is not a mystic process. It is easy and straightforward to do, but you have to be very careful if you are to discover what is actually being delivered for the cash dollars that you find in state budgets.

• • •

Niemeyer: This is a good moment for us to turn to the Children's Pump House Center. Irma Garay, the director, prior to her work at the center, was for many years in community service. The Pump House is in the heart of Harlem, on 126th Street. There are 32 families officially connected with it, and it provides all of the services that Ms. Rowe has mentioned. How did the center ever get started?

• • •

Irma Garay: The community services I worked for was funded by an Office of Economic Opportunity program under the sponsorship of St. Mary's Episcopal Church. I went there as a community organizer. I was very turned off, like everybody else, by the antipoverty program, and I went there feeling very skeptical. Then I began to evaluate and to make surveys of what people wanted and needed in the community. There was a need for day care, even though there was day care in a couple nearby housing projects. We made a special survey of the people as to why they really needed day care — to enable them to go into some kind of training or to go to college, or simply to survive and get jobs and get off the welfare rolls, or just to preserve their own sanity. People started asking me, "Why don't you start a baby-sitting service?" And I said, "I'm going to try."

So I went to the church again and I asked them for donated space. There was no money available; there was nothing but the salary that I was getting for working in community service. So they gave us the space without rent, but that was only for a limited time because I

think they felt that it would never work. But we got in there and we fixed it up. We got the parents we needed to service it. In a matter of two weeks, we had 25 families in this program. Young girls with children, who otherwise would have been sitting at home and just having children one right after the other, then found time to go to college, or possibly to high school, and continue their education; maybe they were high school dropouts. Women who wanted to get off the welfare rolls, women who needed to help their husbands in order to pay the rent and just survive, came in to us, and they became the Board of the Children's Pump House.

The reason it is named Pump House (and I want to insert this because people laugh about it) is because when I went out to try to get other space to build a bigger center — and in New York there is no space; people are living on the windowsills, as you may know — there was a little gas station that was going out of business. So I went to Humble Oil and I asked them how much they wanted for the land. The amount they asked for was only a drop in the bucket for them, so I went hog wild and I said, "Why don't you just donate it to the community?" Well, the idea went to Texas and back again and so forth and so on, but they finally donated this piece of land to us. At this time, as I said, we were not an incorporated group. We were getting money the best way we could. We were going to the local stores asking them for day-old loaves of bread and things like that. So, the deed to the land was put in a St. Mary's Church trust.

We are not what they call an established center. I go as much as I can by the guidelines that the Agency for Child Development, the city funding agency, gives me, with that strict budget. You know — X amount of dollars for food when we do not even have a freezer or anywhere to store food. We have to go daily to the local markets, whether there is a sale on or not.

Geographically we are located between the precinct and the methadone center; the only thing we are trying to do is to help these children and keep the families — everybody in them — from winding up in either place. If we can accomplish that, we're doing a great deal of work. The garbage cans are there; the swimming pools are polluted because they don't even take care of our pools. It is a community that people just don't care about, and I mean that literally. I have gotten on the phone to try and get the Parks Department to come and do what its guidelines tell it to do, to take care of those pools every day, because it is the only way we can take our children near water unless we take them on a long train ride to Coney Island, which is worse.

We have one large room on one floor. One flight up is my office with the family counselor and the bookkeeper and the kitchen in the back. We do everything right in the one room. We have the use of a gym downstairs; we only have the use of it, we do not pay rent, but we

have made a sort of arrangement, and I have a key and we open it when it is raining.

• • •

Gardenia White: As Ms. Rowe stated, the Children's Pump House is truly a family day care program. Working with this program, I am specifically concerned with service to the family. One of the things that Ms. Rowe did not mention is that we do have a full-day educational program for 32 children. We also have a women's consciousness-raising group, after-school tutoring and an inservice training program in conjunction with Bank Street College, where our teachers are getting their state certification. Whenever the needs arise in a family, we try to develop a program to meet those needs of the family.

• • •

Niemeyer: I might say that the Pump House is one of four centers working with Bank Street and a unit of New York State University. It is really a joint development of an effective inservice training program. The college doesn't come in and tell them what to do. The program is based on a joint analysis and evaluation of their needs, the total needs of the center.

• • •

Jackie Monthe: For the last four years I worked in established day care centers in New York City. There is a kind of a hierarchy in day care where you have the old established centers that are run by settlement houses and community centers that are managed by the wealthy people in New York. The board members will come once a month for a meeting, but they do not know the parents, they do not know the children. After the board meeting they leave and they still do not know anything about the parents and the children. Working in that kind of a setting, I found the parents dropped their children off in the morning and picked them up in the afternoon and had no idea of what their children were doing; they had no contact with the school. Working in such a setting, I felt that the children were practically living in the day care center and I did not even know their parents. I did not know what the children did at home and the parents did not know what the children did in school.

When I looked for another job I was very attracted by the family atmosphere at the Pump House. There I not only teach and deal with the children, but I work with the parents as well. The staff holds workshops for the parents. We like to feel we are training the parents,

helping them learn about their children and the growth of their children, about the education that their children should be getting, not only at the Pump House but in later years in the public schools.

At the Pump House I can talk informally with the parents and can get a good idea of what the child's needs are on a particular day. Maybe something happened at home last night, for example, and the child is going to be upset this morning. If I know this, I can give that child just a little something special to help him through the day. And I hope I can give the parents something special, too, if they come to me and say, "Oh, gee, I've been offered a job and I don't know if I should take it," or "Where is a good place to buy shoes?" or, "I just don't really know what to do with myself today."

I feel that the Pump House has a program that is really satisfying the needs of the parents and the children. I think the staff also is growing and learning so much, not only by the training but by being exposed to so many aspects of the school. It helps me get a better understanding of how a school is run, and I hope I can always use it to good advantage.

• • •

Niemeyer: Ms. Garay, you said that one of the things you insist on is that all staff members live in the neighborhood of the center. Is that right?

• • •

Garay: Yes, we try to keep it in the community because I do not think that somebody who lives down on Park Avenue would understand. Community people can really deal with the problems. They can understand that a child might be wearing sneakers in the winter time because his parent probably did not have the money to buy shoes and the sneakers were cheap. Outsiders cannot understand some of the husbands and wives, the bickering and fighting that sometimes goes on simply because of the overwhelming problems of surviving with their children, with the rent steadily going up and the food going up.

Community members, on the other hand, have the same problems, so they can understand. When a parent comes to them with a problem, they know that they went through that problem, too, and they know how they managed to overcome it. So they're the best psychologists in the world. They can tell that parent, "Look, this is what I did when it happened to me." Those parents are able to relate to that teacher because they do not feel they are getting a lesson out of a book.

Niemeyer: Tell us a little bit about your problems with the state. What really would be the most helpful, if policies were changed at the state level?

• • •

Garay: One of the problems with the state is that it tends to equate New York City with the rest of the state where the cost of living is much lower and people can have homes of their own at mortgages lower than the New York City rent for a four-room apartment infested with roaches and mice. When they decide in Albany what budget they are going to allot to our center in New York City, they do it without the input of the people who are directly responsible, who are working with this center and know what the costs are and how much we have to struggle to keep within the guidelines of that budget.

I am constantly in trouble with the agency for going over the budget. Our budget was made up in 1966; it has not changed since then. They have not taken into consideration that the telephone company wants more money, that Con Edison wants more money, that the food stores want more money, that the unions want more money, that the cost of everything — cubbyholes, cots, everything — has gone up double or more. They still want you to keep within that guideline, and it's impossible.

• • •

Niemeyer: Is there any mechanism through which people like you, who are right down there at the grass roots working with these families, can talk to legislators?

• • •

Garay: No, we don't. The Agency for Child Development has two buildings full of what they call technical consultants, educational consultants, health consultants, social service consultants, nutritional consultants. But it is actually a police department to see that you stay within the guidelines of the budget that they have given you. I have been lucky. There are two or three consultants who come to the Pump House, and we have built a kind of rapport among us. I take them around to the food shops and show them how much things cost. And so they know; they have seen it. But when they go back to their office, they tell themselves there is nothing they can do about it. We have to be accountable to the Agency for Child Development, which is a funding agency under the city's Human Resources Administration, but that agency does not have to be accountable to us. That is what I feel is so unfair.

Rowe: Let me just say this to legislators. Places like Pump House are vastly more cost effective than public education. Each of the state dollars spent on a center like that is, as you have heard, "levered" or multiplied, by a factor of, say, 6 to 8. First, because probably three-quarters of the money is federal in origin; that is already a leverage of 1 to 4. But second, because each cash dollar is levered by 50 cents or maybe even one dollar with the in-kind services, the overtime and the donations. That means that if you look at the moneys that the state has approved, you find a child care service for something like \$4,000 per child per year, of which \$1,000 is state money. If you look at the approved cash cost per human-service hour in the state of New York at that center, the yearly cost might be somewhere between \$2,000 and \$3,000. You will see this is an enormously cost-effective use for state dollars in this particular case. Each state dollar buys four dollars' worth of child service and six to eight dollars' worth of human service.

• • •

Ruopp: I have been asked a couple times about whether states can really get it together. Well, we have some evidence that some states are doing it. It is not easy, however. It is not easy because most states have entrenched bureaucracies that not only compete with the public about licensing and regulation issues in day care, but compete with each other — the health department, the department of employment services, the department of labor and various other state departments. There is a need to pick a single point in a state bureaucracy to begin to organize some cooperation. It is my own personal belief that that can do more for the quality of child care than worrying about putting a lot of restrictions and regulations on local centers.

If I were a state legislator, I would work to have only one single point of quality control, initially, and that would be the competency of the day care center director or home mother. I would certify directors and home mothers and leave everything else alone, because competent leadership will almost always make competent day care settings. It is an old-fashioned American notion that somebody who knows how to do something gets it done.

I think that states can do a lot more. It is really a matter of organizing the bureaucracy to get the job done well. Spend some Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) funds on research. That can be done. The state of Maryland put only \$12,000 of its own money into the study we did for them, and SRS supplied the other \$48,000. So you can use some of the AFDC Title IV funds for research for the survey Ms. Rowe talked about and lever those federal dollars as far as you can.

Making State Policies for Children

Dale Bumpers, Governor of Arkansas

We have become increasingly aware in America of the need to plan for the wise use of our natural resources — for the preservation of forests and wildernesses, for unpolluted streams and air, for more constrained energy use. As a measure of our concern for the environment, we require anyone planning any major projects to file an Environmental Impact Statement.

John Kennedy once said children are our most valuable resource and our best hope for the future. I think we all agree, and I would suggest that what we need in the future is an Early Childhood Development Impact Statement. No matter what kind of education dollars are flowing into the state, I do not think it would hurt to file a statement saying what the effect of this will be on children from birth to 5 years of age. In the past, our planning for children in this country has been mostly on a hit-or-miss basis. We have been filling in the gaps, providing fragmented programs, and the results have been just less than chaotic.

As the husband said to his paramour, "We can't go on like this." Our best hope lies with those states that are beginning to move toward comprehensive planning for children's programs. Instead of reacting to federal priorities that have been both unrealistic and disappointing, some states are building priorities of their own. They are defining quality and taking steps to see that this quality is achieved. The federal programs might take note and follow suit.

States have been criticized in the past for resisting change and considered less competent to plan for and administer children's programs than those at the federal levels. This is spurious thinking. States are proving that they have the capacity for leadership and that they respect the rights of communities to determine how programs should be operated at the local level. Those closest to children — parents, child care personnel, teachers — are being involved in designing programs, and the result is more coherent, more practical policies. State planning has centered around the needs of the child and his family and has not indulged the common, but false, logic that because a service was available, needs were being met. We at the state level are eliminating barriers that keep children from receiving services. This means getting more results out of present dollars spent on children's programs and less duplication and overlap.

Let me give an example. Public health clinics in Arkansas had

furnished free immunizations for years — that is, the service was available. But records showed that at least half the children between 6 months and 11 years had not been fully immunized. Four out of every five 2-year-olds had not received the recommended four polio doses. It was like sitting on a keg of dynamite.

In 1964 the nation suffered a dramatic outbreak of rubella, and in Arkansas, for instance, this resulted in several hundred rubella-syndrome children. When we began to plan an action program to prevent this from happening again, we found that many parents did not know that their children needed immunizations. Some did not have transportation; others worked and could not bring their children during the hours the clinics were open. Mrs. Bumpers organized a massive corps of volunteers, along with the Arkansas League for Nursing, and I recruited the Arkansas National Guard and State Health Department.

These and representatives of other government agencies and private organizations joined together to assist the local health units in conducting 250 weekend immunization clinics last September. The campaign used many methods of getting the word to parents — spot announcements, news stories, pamphlets, telephone calls. Volunteers and guardsmen worked out transportation systems, and the weekend clinic hours eliminated the problems of working parents. Some 66,000 children received inoculations as a result of the weekend clinics alone. More than 300,000 were immunized from the time the publicity started until the September clinics were completed. An annual U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare regional report showed that immunizations for childhood disease last year increased 102 per cent in Arkansas as compared with a 32 per cent increase in the five other states in the region. I tell you that story simply because it shows what action can do.

Mrs. Bumpers is now organizing a second immunization drive this year called "Operation Wipeout," which will be directed primarily toward the very young children, ages 2 months to 4 years, who were missed in last year's campaign. This year a more sustained drive is planned over a four-month period. Public health clinic hours are being adjusted to the late afternoon and evening needs of working parents. Volunteer action centers and the National Guard are notifying parents and furnishing transportation again. The objective this time is to develop the pattern for a permanent program of parent education and clinic accessibility. The total cost is about what it would cost the state to care for two rubella-syndrome children through a lifetime.

The agencies that worked together on this drive ranged from the Cooperative Extension Service to the County Judges Association, and the results proved that coordination at the state level can produce cooperation at the local levels as well. The fact that these agencies are

willing to get together and repeat last year's effort is proof that a continuing effort of this kind is possible.

Last year we began the same kind of coordinated effort in planning for all children. This planning culminated in the establishment of an interagency council on early childhood planning. We combined two offices, the Office of Early Childhood Development in the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services and the Follow-Through Office in the Department of Education, into the Office of Early Childhood Planning. Our present goal is to establish a single office for children within the Department of Education, but it will draw on every agency that deals with children or renders children's services.

Our decision to move in this direction has been based on several factors. When we reorganized state government in Arkansas three years ago, we took 65 departments and combined them into 13 major departments. We assigned all programs to those basic units. One purpose, of course, was to streamline government, but you cannot streamline government unless you bring about a realignment of compatible programs, particularly the newer ones that had been previously set apart. I feel strongly that the major old-line agencies must be seriously involved in any planning that attempts to meet the total developmental needs of children. Change will not happen unless those agencies are involved in and directly committed to the planning effort. Since the Department of Education has, through local school districts, a base in every local community, and since it does touch the life of every child, this seemed the logical place to get the widest possible program impact.

Since our Early Childhood Office was the first to be set up in the country (in 1968), we have had the advantage of experience with several alternatives, first having it as a wing of the governor's office, then in Social and Rehabilitation Services, and now assigned to the Department of Education. We have found that in planning for children, as in all planning, the temptation is to see present agencies and institutions as intractable and unyielding and to use that as an excuse to bypass them. Their new agencies are established and they in turn become as bureaucratic as those they were designed to replace. This is both costly and, in the end, more divisive. It does not make sense to pull children in different directions because of incompatible systems. It is our responsibility to make those systems with which the child is already involved consistent and responsive to his total needs.

I am not suggesting that all new money go through the old channels, but it seems that sensible state planning must involve those agencies presently administering the bulk of the money for children. Local planning must, in the same way, especially involve the public schools, even though they may have been unresponsive to some of the needs of young children in the past. The point is, rather than working around institutions, I believe we must work with them. Planning must be done in a manner that brings together those who deal with children

at different stages in their development, as well as those who work across agency or institutional lines.

It seems to me that by maintaining this contact and influence, those who are working in early childhood have a unique opportunity to revitalize systems. When we talk about the involvement of the public schools, for instance, it is obvious that we do not want to extend schooling, in its most rigid sense, downward. I want early childhood training to avoid the rigid stereotype programs; I want broad opportunities and broad visions, not tunnel vision. It is the only method by which every child has an equal chance. I believe early childhood programs have the potential for a great impact on the public schools. Much early childhood research has dealt with how children learn, which people are important to that learning and what community resources can be made available to the learner. The possibilities that are thereby opened to the rest of education are immense, and those who are policymakers at the state and federal levels should consider them thoughtfully.

When I became governor in 1971, Arkansas was not only without public school kindergartens, but there was still considerable opposition to the concept. Last year we managed to get enough funding from the legislature to begin a kindergarten program for 44 per cent of our 5-year-olds. I considered it an accomplishment of major proportions. With just one year's experience to demonstrate their value, I went back to a special session of the legislature last month with a request for full funding. The opposition had dissolved and this fall, kindergartens will be available to every 5-year-old in Arkansas.

Part of our early childhood planning has been directed toward keeping the new kindergarten program from becoming isolated either from the primary grades above it or from the nursery school and day care programs below. To accomplish this, the Office of Early Childhood Planning started a Child Development course on Educational Television (ETV). We stressed coordination and continuity. Representatives of early childhood programs at all levels participated in the 32-week series that was offered for college credit. Study guides were mailed each month to more than a thousand persons ranging from parents to elementary principals. The Department of Education's kindergarten staff is following up this year with a second ETC course aimed at primary teachers, and still another ETV series on parent training is in the planning stages.

Our Office of Early Childhood Planning held a series of eight planning forums earlier this year. A need for better parent training and education was identified as a high priority, so the office is working through local communities to set up Parent and Child Resource Centers. Staffed by volunteers to offer parent training to young families, these centers are a substitute for the extended family, offering help with the everyday problems that young parents face. In addition, the office will start mailing informational pamphlets to the

parents of first-borns at intervals during the first six years of the child's life. These will reach the parents of 10,000 children in Arkansas this first year alone.

Citizen involvement in the planning process is coming from Committees for Children, which were set up as a result of the planning forums to furnish continued input and to serve as advocates for children. The state plan calls for regional children's centers that would coordinate existing programs, offer some alternative programs for young children and furnish both staff and parent training.

Our planning is not built around finding a single solution. It does not call for putting all young children into group child care or educational programs, but for offering options that fit family and child needs. I think we are proceeding sensibly, without making exaggerated claims for early childhood programs, without pretending that we have all the answers. We are concerned about the quality of family life generally, about the impact of many changes in the last two decades and how they may adversely affect young children. We are concerned about the physical and mental disabilities from which children now suffer that can be prevented. We have tried to be honest, promising no panaceas because we think the likelihood of children being shortchanged is reduced when policymakers are candid and truthful.

I do not want to start placing blame for our past failures and shortsightedness, but the federal government has been remiss in not planning children's programs. The conglomeration of guidelines and eligibility requirements that comes down to state and local levels often seems designed to keep children from getting services rather than making such services available. The cutbacks, the veto of the comprehensive child care legislation and the off again-on again directives of the last two years have contributed to a national policy with regard to children that can only be interpreted as negative.

National statistics about children are unsettling. It has been estimated that more than half of all handicaps could be prevented or lessened with better prenatal care and with early diagnosis and treatment. Yet one million babies are born each year to mothers who do not receive medical care during pregnancy, and many handicaps are neither identified nor treated until the child reaches school age.

Researchers tell us that only 5 to 10 per cent of the money spent on health care in America is spent on those under age 21. Childhood diseases such as scarlet fever, rheumatic fever, diphtheria and measles — which we are capable of controlling and preventing — still regularly take their toll in disabilities and death.

More than half of all women who have school-aged children were working in 1972, and more than one in three of the mothers of children under 6 were in the labor force. Yet high-quality child care for all children who need it, at a price their families can afford, is still for the most part unavailable.

Every state has its own set of statistics on child abuse that is on the increase, on low-birth weight, high-risk babies, on teen-age pregnancies, on accidents in which children die from fires, from poisonings, from drownings, on the absence of good child care and preschool programs.

It is obvious that a larger effort on behalf of children must be made, and, speaking on behalf of a state that is interested in making that effort, I would like to offer some suggestions for a state policy for children.

First, since so much of the learning that helps to shape a person's life takes place before the age of 5, some form of education should be made available to all children and their parents who wish to take advantage of it much earlier than traditionally provided.

Second, since there are no absolute answers as to what kind of education is best for children and their parents, a variety of approaches and learning situations should be offered.

Third, parent involvement in planning is essential to keep professionals in touch with reality. It is harder, with parents involved, for professionals to assume they know what is best for children and to come up with easy mass solutions instead of having to deal with the differences in each child and each family.

Fourth, continuity between programs run by different agencies or even within a single agency is essential. Children do not grow and develop in segments, and early childhood programs should not be fragmented or kept separate from programs for older children. A connection between the two should be maintained.

Fifth, families who have been shunted from agency to agency in search of services for children know better than anyone why coordination and an overall information system are needed. It is possible to accomplish more for children, as we learned in the immunization drive in Arkansas, when many agencies pool their resources and work together.

In his book, *Escape From Childhood*, John Holt makes the claim that children are capable of far more than we have allowed; that families and schools have fostered an unhealthy kind of dependence that often hampers rather than facilitates growth. Perhaps the movement toward earlier education, with its emphasis on diverse ways of developing and learning, will also affect the way we think about older children. Why should there not be more ways to learn and grow outside as well as inside school and away from home?

Because Arkansas is still bound by many rural traditions, we have been able to get people to work together in a way that is admittedly harder to accomplish in more heavily populated areas. When differences occur, and they have, they can be hammered out on a person-to-person basis. Those who get together know local situations well enough to plan individually for them.

Our problems are not related to bigness but to smallness — to

counties where there are no doctors much less pediatricians, to counties where there is no public day care, to school districts that enroll less than 100 students — which means an absence of resources. But it also means that our problems are often of a more manageable size than some of those in larger states. Certainly each state has its own unique set of problems and potential in programs for children, and I am impressed with the competency and the creativeness exhibited in those states that have established procedures for dealing comprehensively with the needs of children. I believe that we have the capability and talent within each state to make better things happen and that, with the development of a partnership of trust between the state and federal levels, the future can be a bright one for young children.

Program Participants and Resource Consultants

- Allen, Sally V., Director, ECS Communications Department, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203
- Bumpers, Dale, Governor, State Capitol, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
- Caldwell, Bettye, Professor of Education, University of Arkansas, 814 Sherman Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72202
- Carmichael, Benjamin E., Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, 100 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219
- Finberg, Barbara D., Program Officer, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 437 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022
- Fraser, Brian, Staff Attorney, National Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect, 1001 Jasmine, Denver, Colorado 80220
- Gallagher, James T., Director, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
- Garay, Irma, Director, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027
- Granato, Sam, Day Care Officer, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 2017 N.W. Irving, Portland, Oregon 97210
- Green, Frederick, Associate Director, Children's Hospital National Medical Center, and Director of the Center's Office for Child Health Advocacy, 2125 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
- Hawes, John R. B., Jr., Executive Director, Learning Institute of North Carolina, 1006 Lamond Street, Durham, North Carolina 27701
- Hensley, Gene, Director, HACHE Project, Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203
- Himelrick, John B., Sr., Director, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, Capitol Complex, Charleston, West Virginia 25305
- Hughes, Jerome M., State Senator, 328 Capitol Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
- Lazarus, Wendy, Health Specialist, Children's Defense Fund, 1763 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
- Liederman, David S., Director, Office for Children, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

- Martin, Edward, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of the Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, 7th & F Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202
- Meredith, Judith C., Former Director of Community Development Office for Children, 52 Howe Street, Farmington, Massachusetts 01701
- Mondale, Walter, United States Senator, Washington, D.C. 20510
- Monthe, Jacqueline, Classroom Staff Member, Children's Pump House of New York, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027
- Nesenholtz, David, Planning Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711
- Niemeyer, John H., President Emeritus, Bank Street College of Education, 77 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10011
- O'Keefe, Ann, National Director, Home Start and Child and Family Resource Program, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C. 20013
- Pierson, Donald E., Director, Brookline Early Education Project, 40 Centre Street, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146
- Rowe, Mary, Special Assistant to the President and Chancellor for Women and Work, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Building 10 - Room 213, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
- Rowe, Richard, Associate Professor, Clinical Psychology and Public Practice Program, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- Ruopp, Richard, Vice President, Human Development Area, ABT Associates, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- Sanstad, Margaret H., Day Care Specialist, Office of Child Development - Region X, 710 Second Avenue, Room 1490, Seattle, Washington 98104
- Sargent, Jessie F., Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts, Room 153A, Statehouse, Boston, Massachusetts 02133
- Schrag, Howard, Director, Human Development Institute, Statehouse, Boise, Idaho 83720
- Sugarman, Jule, Chief Administrative Officer, City Hall, Atlanta, Georgia 30303
- Tillman, Melissa, Director, Day Care Licensing and Consulting Unit, Office for Children, Room 246, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116
- Watson, Jeannette, Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711

White, Burton, Director, Preschool Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 415 Larsen Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

White, Gardenia, Training Consultant, Children's Pump House of New York, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027

Wolverton, E. Dollie, Program Planning Specialist, Children's Bureau, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C. 20012

Symposium Participants

Abraham, Nancy, Director, State Office of Child Development, Utah
Abrams, Rosalie S., State Senator, Maryland
Alford, Roy, Associate Director, MPEP, West Virginia
Andrews, J.D., National Conference Coordinator, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
Atkins, Hannah, State Representative, Oklahoma
Auman, T. Clyde, State Representative, North Carolina
Backman, Jack, State Senator, Massachusetts
Bacon, Randy, Kentucky Infant and Preschool Project, Kentucky
Baines, G.R.H., Regional Program Director OCD, OHD, DHEW, Illinois
Barry, Mary, Coordinator, Exceptional Child Component, Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
Bates, Sue Ann, Preschool-Kindergarten Consultant, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Bauer, Randall, Early Childhood Education, Pennsylvania
Beck, Rochelle, Editor/Researcher, Children's Defense Fund, Massachusetts
Blair, Marie P., Child-Care Coordinator, Bureau of Social Welfare, Maine
Bloom, Marlene, Senior Editor, Education U.S.A., Virginia
Boone, Rosa, Early Childhood Consultant, Department of Community Action, Connecticut
Boverini, Walter J., State Senator, Massachusetts
Brooks, Chet, State Senator, Texas
Browne, James, Coordinator, The Associates Program Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.
Bullock, Joan, Director, Mobilization of Resources, New Jersey
Bunton, Scott, Staff Administrator, Texas House of Representatives, Texas
Burrell, Tina, Specialist, Community Services for Children, Office of Human Development, DHEW, Massachusetts
Bursley, Gilbert, State Senator, Michigan
Butler, John A., Associate, Harvard Health Project, Massachusetts
Campbell, Bertha, Supervisor, Bureau Child and Parent Education, State Education Department, New York
Campbell, Faye, Director, Head Start Training, Office of the Governor, SEOC, Oklahoma
Capp, Dee, S. W. Consultant, Maternal and Child Health, State Department and Environmental Services, Montana
Carnes, Betty, Director, Office of Child Development, South Carolina
Carpenter, Phoebe, Administrator of Community Coordinated Child Care for Central Florida, Inc., Florida
Carter, Many, Director, Haley Bell Child Development Center, Michigan
Cataldo, Michael, Regional Director, Institute for the Development of Human Resources, New York
Chandler, Richard, State Representative, Kentucky
Chapman, Evelyn, Child Care Coordinator, City of Seattle, Department of Human Resources, Washington

Chase, Richard Allen, M.D., Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Maryland

Clancy, Johann, Consultant, Early Child Education, Department of Education, Florida

Clay, Barbara Lou, Director, Early Childhood Planning, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, West Virginia

Colley, Pat, Office of Urban and Federal Affairs, Tennessee

Collins, Betsy, Executive Secretary, Interagency Council for Child Development, Vermont

Collins, Kenalene J., State Representative, Vermont

Comba, Trudy, Director of Early Child Programs, Boise State University, Idaho

Contois, Duane, Northwest Human Services, Michigan

Copeland, Janet E., Program Coordinator, Department of Mental Health, Tennessee

Dallas, Jo, Institute for Children, Department of Human Resources, Kentucky

Davis, Glenn H., Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, California

Davis, Renee A., Child Development Specialist, Office of Child Development, DHEW, Massachusetts

Days, Pat, National Association for Child Development and Education, Washington, D.C.

Dermatis, Sophie, Consultant, Office for Children, Massachusetts

Devitt, James, State Senator, Wisconsin

Diepenbrock, Bill, Office of Child Development, Washington, D.C.

Dixon, Brooke, Education Director, Oakland County Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan

Doran, Rodney L., Administrative Assistant, Office of the Governor, Connecticut

Drain, Theodore R., Director, State Department of Public Instruction, North Carolina

Draper, Wanda, Early Childhood Specialist, Oklahoma

Dreps, Frances M., Day Care Services Supervisor, DHR, Division of Social Services, North Carolina

Duffy, Sr. Elizabeth, R.S.M., Director, Roger Williams Day Care Center, Rhode Island

Dumas, Leonard C., State Senator, Tennessee

Edwards, A. L. "Nancy," Project Director, Appalachia Child Care Projects, Georgia

Ellen, David H., State Senator, Delaware

Espinosa, Renato, Component Coordinator-Parenting Materials Center, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Texas

Faust, William, State Senator, Michigan

Fendley, Carey, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Fink, Arlene, Assistant Director, Preschool Project, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, California

Flaherty, Michael F., State Representative, Massachusetts

Flores, Rudy, Special Assistant, Office of the Governor, Texas

Floyd, LaNue, State Senator, South Carolina

Flurry, Ruth C., Bureau Chief, Bureau Child and Parent Education, State Education Department, New York

Galvin, Marie, Director, Head Start/Day Care, Massachusetts

Garrison, James B., Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Garvin, Jean, Department of Education, Vermont

Geier, Mark, Program Assistant, Carnegie Corporation, New York
 Gemma, Sr. Mary, R.S.M., Diocesan Supervisor, Diocese of Portland, Maine
 Gerhart, Rolland C., Acting Director, Office of Child Development, Vermont
 Germanowski, Glen Ko, Staff Representative, State Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
 Gibson, Gertha, State Day Care Training Director, Department of Human Resources, North Carolina
 Gile, Mary Stuart, Consultant, Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, New Hampshire
 Gilles, Cynthia, Coordinator, Training, NESEIMC, Massachusetts
 Gleason, David, Program Innovation Division, Office of Child Development, DHEW, Washington, D.C.
 Goble, Galen C., Research Analyst, Senate, Pennsylvania
 Godfrey, Alice, Associate Director, Department of Public Health, Tennessee
 Goldman, Joyce F., Editor, Day Care and Child Development Reports, Washington, D.C.
 Goldman, Karla, Research Associate, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey
 Gordon, Rita, Specialist, Children's Programs, Senate Office of Research, California
 Gore, Jean S., Early Childhood Consultant, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, South Dakota
 Graham, D. Robert, State Senator, Florida
 Graves, David A., Director, Institute for Children, Department for Human Resources, Kentucky
 Green, Cecilia, Executive Director, 4-C Program, New Jersey
 Green, Jane, Project Director, Day Care Project, Office of Child Development, Department of Social Services, South Carolina
 Gudger, Lamar, State Senator, North Carolina
 Haberkorn, Floyd E., Assistant Executive Director, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
 Hager, Elizabeth S., State Representative, New Hampshire
 Haldredge, M. Matthews, Sr., Secretary, Roger Williams Day Care, Rhode Island
 Hale, Fran H., Director, Project Maine Stream Child Development Center, Maine
 Hampton, Wayne, State Representative, Arkansas
 Hantman, Stephen, Coordinator, Huron Institute T/A for OCD Developmental Continuity, Huron Institute, Massachusetts
 Harris, Patrick B., State Representative, South Carolina
 Harter, Michael, Director, Child Development Programs, Mt. St. Mary Hospital, Ohio
 Haslinger, Lee W., Director, Early Childhood Education Programs, Michigan
 Hatton, Joyce, President, Young World Inc., Michigan
 Hauser, Pat., Program Specialist, Wayne County Child Care Coordinating Council, Michigan
 Havel, James T., Legislative Consultant, Health Project, Michigan
 Henderson, Mary, Assistant Director, Urban Coalition Right to Read, Delaware
 Hewett, Kathryn, ABT Associates, Massachusetts
 Hirsch, Elizabeth, Early Childhood Educator, Region VI, Office for Children, Massachusetts
 Hoepfner, Ralph, Director, Preschool Project Center for the Study of Education, UCLA, California
 Holland, Edward M., State Senator, Virginia
 Hopps, June, Deputy Director, Office of Programs and Educational Policy, Ohio

Hubbell, Ruth, Director, Child Development, Office of Education and Training, Mississippi
 Huber, Katherine S., Director, Project Development, GCCAA, Michigan
 Hull, Ann R., State Delegate, Maryland
 Humphrey, Hubert H. III, State Senator, Minnesota
 Isralowitz, Richard, Director, Human Services Development, New Jersey
 Jackson, Nat, Special Assistant, Office of the Governor, Washington
 James, Vernon G., Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
 Jewett, Patricia A., Executive Director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation, Vermont
 Johnson, Dale B., Legislative Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Office, Nebraska
 Johnson, Trude, Chief, Day Care Division, Department of Community Affairs, Connecticut
 Jones, Albert H., President, Delaware Board of Education, Delaware
 Kasley, Doris, President, Council of Cooperative Nurseries, Michigan
 Kelly, Ralph, State Senator, Nebraska
 Kennelly, James P., Program Planner, Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C.
 Kilmer, Sally, Child Development Planning, State Office, Minnesota
 King, Barbara, Department of Education, Massachusetts
 Klein, Jenny W., Director of Education Services, OCD, HEW, Washington, D.C.
 Langen, Rexine A., Educational Consultant, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
 Lester, Juliette, Special Assistant, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
 Levin, Patricia W., Director, Head Start, Pennsylvania
 Liebergoit, Harvey, Director, Revisements and Information, BEH, Massachusetts
 Lind, Jenny W., Assistant Division Administrator, Division of Family Services, Wisconsin
 Lindquist, Fritz, AFT, Massachusetts
 Litman, Frances, Assistant Professor, Wheelock College, Massachusetts
 Long, E. Alison, Staff Member, Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
 Ludwig, Stephen B., Child Care Consultant, Department of Health and Welfare, Maine
 Lund, Sylvia, Chairperson, State Board of Education, Maine
 Mack, Helen, Child Care Services Coordinator, Mt. Calvary Family Development Day Care Center, Ohio
 Marsh, Shirley, State Senator, Nebraska
 Martin, Francis M., Staff Representative, Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
 Mathis, Carolyn, State Representative, North Carolina
 Maura, Sister, R.S.M., Teacher, Diocese of Portland, Maine
 Maureen, Sister, R.S.M., Teacher, Diocese of Portland, Maine
 Maurer, Lucille, State Representative, Maryland
 Maynard, Marjorie, Associate Consultant, Early Childhood Education, Department of Education, Connecticut
 McDaniel, Harry W., Consultant, PATCO, Missouri
 McDiarmid, Dorothy S., State Representative, Virginia
 Messner, David, Chairman, Commonwealth Child Development Committee, Pennsylvania
 Metger, Robert Earl, Child Development Coordinator, Appalachian Health Council, South Carolina
 Miller, Stephen C., Attorney at Law, Education Law Center, Pennsylvania

Moore, Jennie L., Public Health Nursing Consultant, Department of Public Health, Tennessee

Moore, Jennie Lee, Nursing Supervisor, Upper Cumberland Child Development Project, Tennessee

Moore, Raymond S., President, Hewitt Research Center, Michigan

Morgan, Gwen, Vice President, Day Care and Child Development Council, Massachusetts

Mouton, John J., Acting Regional Program Director for Child Development, Office of Human Development, DHEW, Georgia

Mowles, Cynthia E., Consultant, Early Childhood Education, Division of Instruction, Department of Education, New Hampshire

Murphy, Cecile, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Murphy, Sara, Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood Planning, Arkansas

Murray, Frank J., State Representative, Maine

Naddoff, George A., President, Living & Learning Schools, Massachusetts

Nock, Suzanne, Staff Assistant, Flint, Genesee County, 4-C, Michigan

North, Robert, State Senator, Minnesota

Northcott, Anne L., Research Evaluation and Planning Office, Maine

O'Connor, Kathleen, Project Management Specialist, Urban Affairs Department, Missouri

Ogden, Bruce, Consultant, Assembly Office of Research, California

Orlett, Edward J., State Representative, Ohio

Osborn, Charles D., Director, Curriculum Division, Department of Public Instruction, Indiana

Palmer, Louise, Legislative Assistant to Delegate Dorothy McDiarmid, Virginia

Park, Judy, Administrative Assistant, Head Start/Day Care, Massachusetts

Patten, Mary, Child Care Specialist, 4 C's, Montana

Patterson, Carson, Executive Director, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan

Pautz, Harold D., Director, Child Development Services, Community Action Agency, Michigan

Penick, George D., Program Planner, Office of Child Development, North Carolina

Petsche, Mary M., Child Care Supervisor, Nebraska

Pettee, Robert H., Fiscal Officer, Office of Child Development, North Carolina

Pick, Ada, ECS Commissioner, New Mexico

Pierce, Priscilla, Director, Urban Coalition Right to Read, Delaware

Pierson, Marty, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Pisani, Joseph R., State Senator, New York

Primm, Gloria J., Administrative Assistant, Carnegie Corp., New York

Prizer, Dana C., Consultant, Educational Projects, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Reed, Sereetta H., Chairman, State Commission, Children and Youth, Alabama

Reichert, Conrad A., Vice President for Research, Hewitt Research Center, Michigan

Rice, Gerri, Program Developer, Communities United for Action, Michigan

Roberts, Lowell, Assistant Director, Appalachian Child Development Project, New York

Robinson, Mary E., Coordinator, Early Childhood Education, State Department of Education, Maryland

Romer, William M., Director, Appalachian Child Development Project, New York

Rose, June, Research Associate, Huron Institute, Massachusetts

Rosen, Judith, Administrative Assistant, Office of the County Executive, Virginia

Rosenquest, Barbara, Resource Teacher, Roger Williams Day Care Center,
 Rhode Island
 Rosenstreich, Judy, State Representative, Vermont
 Rosenthal, Harold P., Assistant Director, Division of Youth and Family Services,
 New Jersey
 Rosoff, Saul R., Acting Director, Office of Child Development, HEW,
 Washington, D.C.
 Ross, Phyllis, Assistant Head, National Council of Jewish Women, New York
 Rude, Gordon, Health Consultant, Health Project, Michigan
 Russell, Karlene, Director of Elementary and Secondary Education
 Instructional Service, State Department of Education, Vermont
 Rustici, Jean, Early Childhood Consultant, State Department of Education,
 Connecticut
 Ryan, Charlotte, President, FTSA, Massachusetts
 Sanchez, David J., Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education,
 California
 Sapinsley, Lila M., State Senator, Rhode Island
 Sazer, Nina, State Coordinator, Children '76, New Hampshire
 Scalera, Nicholas R., Assistant Director, Youth and Family Services, New
 Jersey
 Schneider, Rev. Albert, Superintendent, Archdiocese of Santa Fe, New
 Mexico
 Schneider, Dorothy, Coordinator, Flint-Genessee County 4-C, Michigan
 Schwartz, B.D., State Representative, Commission on Children with Special
 Needs, North Carolina
 Schwartz, Susan, Administrative Assistant, Governor's Commission on
 Children and Youth, Maryland
 Schwyn, Sally, Director, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan
 Scigaj, Maureen, Day Care Licensing Specialist, Department of Health and
 Social Services, Division of Family Services, Wisconsin
 Seele, Helen, Director, Windham Area Head Start, Connecticut
 Seguin, Florence, Program Associate, Home Start/Child and Family Resource
 Program/OCYD/HEW, Washington, D.C.
 Seitzer, Robert H., Region 2 Commissioner, USOE, New York
 Sharpe, Kennedy H., State Senator, North Carolina
 Shaw, Elizabeth, State Senator, Iowa
 Shea, James E., Assistant Secretary to the Governor, New York
 Sherman, Edward, Director Child Development, Connecticut
 Sherretts, Steven, Associate Psychologist, Psychiatric Institute, Nebraska
 Shinn, Thomas V., ABT Associates, Massachusetts
 Shurling, Ray, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
 Silver, Joyce, Research Assistant, Brookline Institute, Washington, D.C.
 Smith, Jean D., Child Development Specialist, Office of Child Development,
 Tennessee
 Smith, Marilyn M., Executive Director, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
 Smith, Teresa K., Child Care Specialist, Woonsocket Council of Community
 Services, Rhode Island
 Smithberg, Lorraine, Follow-Through Program, Bank Street College, New
 York
 Sohner, Linda, Program Specialist, ARC Child Development, Ohio
 Staley, Carl C., Executive Director, United Day Care Services, North
 Carolina
 Strickland, Tom, State Senator, North Carolina
 Stromer, Gerald A., State Senator, Nebraska
 Sweitzer, David, Child Development Coordinate, Office of Child
 Development, Tennessee
 Tantum, Anne R., Director, Administrator and Supervision, Department of
 Education, New Jersey

Taylor, Don, Executive Director, Child Advocacy Council, Washington, D.C.
 Taylor, Linda, Department for Human Resources, Bureau for Social Services,
 Kentucky
 Taylor, Nan, National Board, Day Care and Child Development Council of
 America, Connecticut
 Taylor, Theodore, Executive Director, Day Care and Child Development
 Council of America, Washington, D.C.
 Teitelbaum, Mrs. M.D., Executive Director, 4 C Committee, Maryland
 Thomas, Ora H., Executive Director, KCMC Day Care Center, Missouri
 Thomas, Sharon, Program Specialist, Division of Family Services, Utah
 Travis, Nancy W., Regional Director, Southwest Regional Office, Day Care
 and Child Development Council of America, Georgia
 Truan, Carlos, State Representative, Texas
 Tufts, Jean, State Board of Education, New Hampshire
 Varner, June, Child Development Specialist, Buckeye Hills, Hocking Valley
 Regional Development, Ohio
 Walker, Ernest, Trainer Coordinator, Infant and Preschool Project, Kentucky
 Ward, Betty, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, Oklahoma
 Warner, Donna, Cost Effects Study, ABT Associates, Inc., Massachusetts
 Wasai, Richard, State Representative and Chairman, House Education
 Committee, Hawaii
 Weatherford, Robert, Special Assistant to U.S. Commission of Education,
 Virginia
 Weekes, Nona, Early Childhood Education, Bank Street College, New York
 Weinstein, Marlene, Director, Learning Center of the Medical College of
 Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
 Weisberg, Allan, Department of Education, Massachusetts
 Weisinger, Ron, Consultant, Day Care and Child Development Council of
 America, Florida
 White, James H., State Senator, Tennessee
 White, Robert, Director, Division of Economic Opportunity, Oklahoma
 Williams, Richards S., Research Educationalist, UCLA/CSE, California
 Wilson, Dustin, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.
 Winter, Mildred M., Director, Early Childhood Education, State Department
 of Education, Missouri
 Wolff, Eliza, Assistant Director, Upper Cumberland Child Development
 Project, Tennessee
 Wrightson, Frederick, Executive Director, Association for Child Development
 and Education, Massachusetts
 Wriston, Michael, Day Care Program Consultant, Division of Social Services,
 SRS, Vermont
 Yurchak, Mary Jane, Supervisor, Brookline Education Program,
 Massachusetts

Symposium Agenda

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31

7-9:00 p.m. Registration

Third Floor
Foyer

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1

8:00 a.m. Registration

Third Floor
Foyer

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introduction of
Symposium Resource Consultants:

Commonwealth

Sally V. Allen, Director, ECS
Department of Communications

Opening Remarks:

Mrs. Francis W. Sargent, Wife of
the Governor of Massachusetts

10:00 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30 a.m. "Reassessing Our Educational
Priorities"

Commonwealth

Burton White, Director, Preschool
Project, Harvard Graduate
School of Education, Cambridge,
Mass.

12:00 Noon Luncheon

Fairfax

"Who Will Deliver Education to
Preschool Children? The Need for
a Policy Decision"

Edwin Martin, Acting Deputy
Commissioner, Bureau of
Education for the Handicapped,
U.S. Office of Education

2:00 p.m.

"Organizing to Deliver Services:
Alternative Approaches"

Commonwealth

Jule Sugarman, Chief
Administrative Officer, Atlanta, Ga.

Panelists:

Benjamin Carmichael, Commis-
sioner of Education, Tennessee

Hubert Humphrey III, State
Senator, Minnesota

David Liederman, Director,
Office for Children, Massachusetts

Barbara Mosses, Chief of Con-
tracts, Grants and Special
Services Division, Department
of Social Services, South Carolina

4-5:30 p.m.

Workshops

These seminars are intended to encourage full and open discussion among all participants.

- *Day Care Licensing*

Sam Granato, Day Care Officer,
Office of Child Development,
U.S. Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
Margaret Sanstad, Day Care
Specialist, Office of Child
Development, Region X, Seattle,
Wash.

Melissa Tillman, Director, Day
Care Licensing and Consulting
Unit, Office for Children,
Massachusetts

Independence
East

- *Needs Assessment*

John Hawes, Executive Director,
Learning Institute of North
Carolina

David Nesenholtz, Planning
Director, Office of Early Child-
hood Development, Texas
Howard Schrag, Director, Office
of Child Development, Idaho

Independence
Center

- *Child Abuse and Neglect*

Brian Fraser, Staff Attorney,
National Center for the Preven-
tion and Treatment of Child
Abuse and Neglect

Independence
West

4-5:30 p.m.

Meet the Experts

Resource consultants will be avail-
able for informal discussion on the
following topics:

- *Child Health Services*

Frederick Green, Associate
Director, Children's Hospital
National Medical Center, and
Director of the center's Office for
Child Health Advocacy
Wendy Lazarus, Health
Specialist, Children's Defense
Fund

Berkeley A

THURSDAY (Continued)

• Child Health Services (Continued)

Richard Rowe, Associate Professor, Clinical Psychology and Public Practice Program, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Mass.

• Services for Handicapped Children

Berkeley B

Gene Hensley, Director, Handicapped Children's Education Project (HACHE), Education Commission of the States

• Organizing at the State Level

Clarendon A

John Himelrick, Director, Inter-agency Council for Child Development Services, West Virginia

Jerome Hughes, State Senator and Chairman, Senate Education Committee, Minnesota

Jeannette Watson, Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, Texas

• Developing Statewide Grass Roots Support

Clarendon B

Judith Meredith, Former Director of Community Development, Office for Children, Mass.

• Recent Federal Programs

Education for Parenthood

Dalton A

Dollie Lynch Wolverton, Program Planning Specialist, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Home Start and the Child and Family Resource Program

Dalton B

Ann O'Keefe, Director, Home Start and Child and Family Resource Program, Office of Child Development, Office of Human Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

THURSDAY (Continued)

6:30 p.m.	No-Host Reception	Commonwealth
8:30 p.m.	"Families and Children: Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?" Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senator, Minnesota	Independence

FRIDAY, AUGUST 2

8:45 a.m.	"Organizing to Deliver Services: The Public School System" Moderator: Barbara Finberg, Carnegie Corporation of New York Panelists: Bettye Caldwell, Center for Early Development and Education, University of Arkansas James Gallagher, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina Donald Pierson, Brookline Early Education Project, Massachusetts	Commonwealth
-----------	---	--------------

10:30 a.m.	"Day Care and Cost Effectiveness: A National Overview and a Case Study" Moderator: John Niemeyer, President Emeritus, Bank Street College of Education, New York City, and President, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. Richard Ruopp, Vice President, Abt Associates, Inc., and Director of the National Cost Effectiveness Day Care Study for the U.S. Office of Child Development Mary Rowe, Special Assistant to the President and Chancellor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Commonwealth
------------	--	--------------

FRIDAY (Continued)

Day Care and Cost Effectiveness (Continued)

Irma Garay, Director, Children's
Pump House Day Care Center,
New York City

Gardenia White, Training
Consultant, Children's Pump
House Day Care Center, New
York City

Jacqueline Monthe, Classroom Teacher,
Children's Pump House Day Care Center,
New York City

12:15 p.m. Luncheon Independence

Speaker:

Dale Bumpers, Governor of
Arkansas

2:15 p.m. Adjournment

ECS STEERING COMMITTEE
1974-1975

Chairman

David Hall, Governor of Oklahoma

Vice Chairman

Hope Kading, Chairman, State PTA Legislative Committee, Idaho

Chairman-Elect

Arch A. Moore Jr., Governor of West Virginia

Treasurer

Bennett D. Katz, State Senator, Maine

Members

Reubin O'D. Askew, Governor of Florida
Christopher S. Bond, Governor of Missouri
Otis R. Bowen, Governor of Indiana
Winfield Dunn, Governor of Tennessee
J. James Exon, Governor of Nebraska
John J. Gilligan, Governor of Ohio
Hunter B. Andrews, State Senator, Virginia
Gilbert E. Bursley, State Senator, Michigan
Joseph C. Harder, Senate Majority Leader, Kansas
Gordon Sandison, State Senator, Washington
Constance E. Cook, State Assemblywoman, New York
Leroy F. Greene, State Assemblyman, California
Floyd M. Sack, State Representative, Colorado
Pete Turnham, State Representative, Alabama
Shiro Amioka, College of Education, University of Hawaii
Robert S. Babcock, Former Provost, Vermont State Colleges
William P. Bittenbender, Chairman, State Board of Education, New Hampshire
Cyril B. Busbee, State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina
Joseph M. Cronin, Secretary of Educational Affairs, Massachusetts
Karl F. Grittner, Principal, Johnson High School, St. Paul, Minn.
Calvin Hart, Principal, Intermediate School 147, Bergenfield, N.J.
Katherine Hurley, Chairman, State Board of Education, Alaska
Bill J. Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Junior College District, Texas
The Rev. John P. Raynor, S.J., President, Marquette University, Wisconsin
Robert G. Schrader, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wyoming
Eldra L. M. Shulterbrandt, Trustee, College of the Virgin Islands

Advisory Members

Rafael Hernandez Colon, Governor of Puerto Rico
Edwin W. Edwards, Governor of Louisiana
Philip W. Noel, Governor of Rhode Island
Jeanette F. Reibman, State Senator, Pennsylvania
Ruth O. Truex, State Senator, Connecticut
B. G. Hendrix, State Representative, Arkansas
James H. Koch, State Representative, New Mexico
Terry Mann, State Representative, Kentucky
Mrs. M. Richmond Farring, Member, Board of Education, Baltimore, Md.
William C. Friday, President, University of North Carolina
Sue Healy, Teacher, South Junior High School, Rapid City, S.D.
Roy E. Lieuallen, Chancellor, State System of Higher Education, Oregon
Darld J. Long, Executive Director, Utah School Boards Association
Mrs. Ray E. Miller, Chairman, State Advisory Council for Vocational Education,
North Dakota
Stanley F. Redeker, Former President, State Board of Regents, Iowa